

NEBRASKA.

William E. Smith, Antioch.
Edward Ericksen, Boelus.

NEW YORK.

Guy M. Lovell, Camillus.
Wright B. Drumm, Chatham.
Benjamin W. Wellington, Corning.
Stuart W. Smyth, Owego.
George F. Hendricks, Sodus.
Fred D. Jenkins, Webster.

OHIO.

Herbert Newhard, sr., Carey.
William H. Taylor, Cuyahoga Falls.
William H. Harsha, Portsmouth.
Clifford D. Calkins, Sylvania.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Walter L. Brinton, Creighton.
Ben G. Swick, Ellwood City.

TEXAS.

Emma L. Willke, Boerne.
John A. Weyand, Carmine.
Oscar O. Ashenhurst, Lorena.
Robert H. Rhodes, Waelder.

VERMONT.

Frank E. Howe, Bennington.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, January 12, 1923.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou hast been the support of the world in ages past and Thou art our hope in years to come. Before Thee we recognize our unworthiness and confess our sins. We would that our ways, our thoughts, and our motives were altogether acceptable to Thee. O establish our principles and may our lives show the tokens of our gratitude. Bless us with the sweet fruits of goodness and spare us ever from reaping the bitter fruits of badness. Mold the fundamental decisions of our characters and always determine their direction. Comfort us day by day with the assurance that Thou art pleased with us. For the sake of Jesus and the cross He bore that we might be saved. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CAPITAL GAINS AND LOSSES.

Mr. MILLS, from the Committee on Ways and Means, by direction of that committee reported the bill H. R. 13770 (Rept. 1388), a bill to amend the revenue act of 1921 in respect to capital gains and losses, and for other purposes, which was ordered printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

EULOGIES.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Sunday, February 18, 1923, be set apart for addresses on the life, character, and public services of the Hon. BOISE PENROSE, the Hon. PHILANDER C. KNOX, the Hon. WILLIAM E. CROW, late Senators from the State of Pennsylvania, and the Hon. CHARLES R. CONNELL, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that February 18, 1923, be set apart for eulogies upon the late Senators and the Representative from the State of Pennsylvania. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BOARD OF REGENTS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 251.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the Senate joint resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate joint resolution (S. J. Res. 251) providing for the filling of two vacancies that will occur on January 14, 1923, and March 1, 1923, respectively, in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress.

Resolved, etc., That the two vacancies that will occur as herein specified in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the

class other than Members of Congress be filled by the reappointment of Henry White, of the city of Washington, whose term will expire January 14, 1923, and of John B. Henderson, of the city of Washington, whose term will expire March 1, 1923.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, lines 7 and 8, strike out the name of John B. Henderson and insert the name of Frederic Adrian Delano.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate joint resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, there is no need of my taking any time to discuss this joint resolution. The terms of these two members expire next Sunday, and unless we act upon it at once there might be some confusion. I ask for a vote. I might state that after the committee had reported the joint resolution Mr. Henderson died, and consequently it was necessary to offer an amendment to strike out his name and insert that of Mr. Delano.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a memorandum of the activities of Mr. Delano, the new member.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The following is the matter referred to:

Frederic Adrian Delano, vice governor of the Federal Reserve Board, Washington, D. C.

Born Hongkong, China, September 10, 1863, both parents being natives of Massachusetts.

A. B., Harvard, 1885.

Began railway service with the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., with engineering party in Colorado, 1885, and same year entered Aurora, Ill., shops of same road, as apprentice machinist; appointed temporarily acting engineer of tests at Aurora, April, 1887; placed in charge bureau of rail inspection at Chicago, July 1, 1887; assistant to second vice president at Chicago, April, 1889; superintendent freight terminals at Chicago, July, 1890; superintendent motive power at Chicago, February 1, 1899; general manager at Chicago, Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad, July 1, 1901-January 10, 1905.

After leaving service of Burlington, was consulting engineer to War Department in relation to railroads in Philippine Islands; president Wheeling & Lake Erie Railroad Co., Wabash-Pittsburgh Terminal Railway Co., May 1, 1905-1908; first vice president Wabash Railway Co., May 1-October 5, 1905; president, October 5, 1905-December, 1911, and one of receivers December, 1911-December, 1913; president Chicago, Indianapolis & Louisville Railway Co., December, 1913-August 10, 1914.

Member Committee on Industrial Relations, 1912-1914; appointed by President Taft and again by President Wilson 1914 member Federal Reserve Board for six-year term, and designated as vice governor for two years; resigned June, 1918, to enter Army, where he attained rank of colonel, Transportation Corps; honorably discharged October 25, 1919.

Member board of overseers of Harvard College; ex-trustee University of Chicago; trustee Chicago Sunday Evening Club; vice president American Unitarian Association, 1907.

Member American Society of Civil Engineers, American Institute Mining Engineers, Western Society of Engineers, American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Railway Association, Franklin Institute, International Railway Congress, Western Railway Club, etc.

Home, Washington, D. C.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13696, the independent offices appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. McARTHUR in the chair.

The Clerk read as follows:

TEMPORARY BUILDING (1800 VIRGINIA AVENUE).

Salaries: For the following employees for the maintenance and protection of the building: Clerk of class 1; chief engineer, \$1,400; assistant engineer, \$1,000; 6 firemen, at \$840 each; electrician, \$1,200; carpenter, \$1,200; general mechanic, \$1,000; guards—3 sergeants at \$930 each, 9 at \$780 each; foreman of laborers, \$840; foreman or forewoman, \$780; 10 laborers at \$600 each; laborers and charwomen, \$3,960; female laborer, \$840; in all, \$34,510.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 27, line 19, strike out the figures "\$840" after the word "laborer," and insert "\$480."

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman state why this change is made?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It is simply a transposition of the figures. They got an 8 in place of a 4. It is to correct an error.

Mr. BLANTON. To reduce the salary?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No; the salary is just the same. The salary is \$480, but in the printing they transposed the figures and made it \$840.

Mr. BLANTON. Does this female laborer give all of her time to the Government?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, on that subject I want to say that engaged in one line of work down in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing we have nine ladies. One of them has faithfully served the Government there for about 30 years, and most of the nine have served the Government over 25 years. They give their full time and yet they are only paid \$50 per month. One of them, at least, knows as much about the business of that Bureau of Engraving and Printing as any other employee in it.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Will the gentleman state what is the nature of their work?

Mr. BLANTON. Now they have been assigned to showing visitors over the building. If that is a work that the Government ought to pay for, it ought to pay an adequate salary.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Are they not receiving honorariums, tips, or something of that kind down there, now?

Mr. BLANTON. I do not think so.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Are they not upon the same footing as the guides around the Capitol, some of whom make really big money?

Mr. BLANTON. I think not.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. By the sale of souvenirs and other things?

Mr. BLANTON. One of them told me that all she received was \$50 a month, and she said that she could not live upon that. She said she thought the Government certainly could raise her salary. She further said she was afraid she was coming to the wrong person, because she had been informed that I was in favor of reducing salaries. I am not in favor of reducing salaries of that kind. The amendment specifying the annual salary at only \$480 is for a woman. The only kind of salaries I am in favor of reducing is where we get a man who, until he began working for the Government, was receiving probably \$1,200 a year, who enters the Government service at \$2,000 a year, and then immediately wants his salary raised to \$5,000 or \$10,000 a year. That is the sort of salary that I am in favor of reducing. I am not in favor of reducing the salary of women to \$480 and \$600 per annum. These women ought to be paid adequately or they ought to be taken off the pay roll. If they are paid by gratuities, by contributions from parties whom they serve in showing the building, they ought to be taken off the Government pay roll entirely. I understand they are getting \$50 a month, and that is their total compensation.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Oh, that is a mistake. They get the bonus. They do not get the entire bonus, but they get a proportionate share of it.

Mr. BLANTON. How much of the bonus?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I think it is about \$160.

Mr. BLANTON. They ought to be paid what other men working for the Government in similar employment receive, where they give their full time to the Government, and I am using these few minutes merely to call this matter to the attention of the particular subcommittee that has it in charge, so that in the future they may fix an adequate salary.

Mr. WASON. Is not that a statutory position?

Mr. BLANTON. I think so.

Mr. WASON. Then, the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations should not legislate, but the matter should go to the proper legislating committee.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I have heard that passing of the buck so much that it now makes me tired to hear it. Whenever any one of the subcommittees of the great Appropriations Committee that has to do with these various supply bills wants to put a piece of legislation on the bill, they put it on, and sometimes they disguise it so that it is hard to tell that it is legislation. They put it in at will, when it appeals to them, but the things that do not appeal to them they leave out, and then fight when we try to put them back.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. Without objection, the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all other expenditures authorized by the act approved September 7, 1916, as amended, and by the act approved June 5, 1920, including the compensation of attorneys, officers, naval architects, special experts, examiners, clerks, and other employees in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; and for all other expenses of the board, including the rental of quarters outside the District of Columbia, law books, books of reference, periodicals, and actual and necessary expenses of members of the board, its special experts, and other employees, or per diem in lieu of subsistence when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, while upon official business away from their designated posts of duty, and including the investigation of foreign discrimination against vessels and shippers of the United States and for the investigation of transportation of immigrants in vessels of the United States Shipping Board, \$317,500.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to find out how much is carried under the United States Shipping Board for the purpose of advertising during the next year?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I do not recall. I do not know that anything is carried, any specific amount, for that purpose. Of course, under the appropriation for administration they could use a certain amount of it, or whatever they saw fit for that purpose.

Mr. SEARS. Of course, under the old act, as the gentleman will recall, we had quite a fight, and there was \$900,000 appropriated for that purpose.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. That was under the Emergency Fleet Corporation; it was not under the Shipping Board at all.

Mr. SEARS. They are so intermingled that it is hard to get them separated. I have read through the Emergency Fleet Corporation fund and I can not find it. I think it is high time that we should quit spending money in advertising that there is nothing to see in America and that people should go to Europe. The people of the country are complaining of high taxes.

Coming up on the train I read a resolution introduced by my distinguished friend from Ohio, Mr. LONGWORTH, to the effect that during the present session at least there would be no bonus bill. Of course, we understand by that, that next year, the same being an election year, there will be a bonus bill. I think it is time for us to quit talking and get down to economy, and if there is anything in this act or any other act authorizing the Shipping Board to continue to spend \$900,000 a year, as they have expended it in the past, for advertising, in my feeble way I shall oppose it, especially after the President came before us and told us that his conscience hurt him so much that he could not remain silent longer, and that we should get rid of the entire Shipping Board.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman exactly, that the best thing that could happen to the United States would be to get rid of the entire Shipping Board, and if gentlemen on the Democratic side, instead of quibbling against small items like this, would rise to the dignity and importance of the United States and establish a merchant marine, they would no longer have ground for complaint against advertising.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, in reply to that, we might rise to emergency conditions as we meet them, but those on the Democratic side would rather give the whole thing away than rise to the emergency of giving to a group of men, whom it is claimed are already known, about \$6,000,000,000 worth of property for \$300,000,000 or \$400,000,000, loan them the money to buy it, and then if they do not like it, take it back from them. Of course, that is the varying difference of policy as between this side and the other side. I am willing to get rid of the Shipping Board, and have been for a good many years, and if they continue to operate it as they have operated it, I think the quicker we get rid of it the better off we will be.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

EMERGENCY SHIPPING FUND.

For expenses of the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, for administrative purposes, miscellaneous adjustments, losses due to the maintenance and operation of ships, for the tie-up, reconditioning and repair of ships, and for carrying out the provisions of the merchant marine act, 1920, (a) the amount on hand July 1, 1923, but not in excess of the sums sufficient to cover all obligations incurred prior to July 1, 1923, and then unpaid; (b) \$50,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this sum shall be used for the payment of claims other than those resulting from the current maintenance and operation of vessels; (c) the amount received during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, from the operation of ships.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 34, line 5, after the words "ships," insert the following proviso: "Provided further, That in no event shall more than \$300,000 of the sum appropriated by this act be used to pay the compensation of attorneys, regular or special, for the United States Shipping Board or the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation."

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have looked through the hearings for this year for some information about the total amount which is being paid attorneys, and I am unable to find anything. Therefore I assume that a similar number of attorneys are still on the roll for this year. I have been informed that a few have been dismissed, but the number has been reduced very little.

Last year, according to the testimony—and I have it here before me—there were \$619,000 appropriated for the employment of attorneys for the Emergency Fleet Corporation and the Shipping Board. The list is shown in the hearings of last year on page 1165, and if there is no objection I shall insert this in the RECORD in reference to the amounts paid. Now, I am serious about this amendment and the purpose for which it is offered. It was shown by the testimony of witnesses that the principal purpose of the employment of these attorneys was the adjustment of claims and the handling of any litigation that might arise. I believe that they can get 15 or 20 lawyers and 15 or 20 claim adjusters and do this work easily and perhaps better than if it is done altogether by high-priced attorneys. About two years ago or a little more than two years ago they were paying \$25,000 to \$30,000 for some lawyers, and a number of them were being paid \$15,000 to \$20,000 each. These salaries were paid until the Congress put a \$11,000 limitation on the payment of the salary of any one attorney. Mr. Schlesinger, who undertakes to justify the employment of these 78 attorneys, testified as to how he obtained the services of and how he happened to employ these great attorneys, and how he happened to secure their services for \$20,000 and \$25,000 a year, and after great persuasion and at a tremendous sacrifice to them he induced them to come here at \$20,000 to \$25,000 a year. But when Congress put on this \$11,000 limitation every one of these high-priced attorneys stayed at \$11,000. They were every one on the list last year, a year and more after they have been employed. I want to read some of the testimony about these lawyers. I believe in the testimony last year it was stated that for only about a year they would need this many attorneys and could reduce the force. Now, I want to say that surely with this limitation of the appropriation to \$300,000 all of the necessary business can be handled.

Now, Mr. Schlesinger undertook to justify the employment of these attorneys and spoke of a man by the name of Fletcher Dobyns:

I engaged Mr. Dobyns at \$15,000 a year. Since the Walsh case his reputation had grown greatly, and he was earning a great deal more money, several times more than that. I got him to come down on account of his friendship for me and because he felt that he could add to his reputation in going through with this Morse situation.

I am sure Mr. Dobyns is a good lawyer. He bears that reputation, and I do not blame him for making the best trade he can.

That reminds me that down on the old farm we had a horse named Dobbins, and it took an earthquake to get him out of a walk, but he could eat more than any horse I ever saw. This man Dobyns had been on the pay roll before. Mr. Schlesinger employed him at \$15,000, but when the \$11,000 limitation was put on he still stayed on the pay roll at \$11,000, notwithstanding he came here at a tremendous sacrifice at \$15,000 a year.

Mr. YATES. He is a horse of another color.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Perhaps so, but he is still able to eat, evidently. Now, here is a man by the name William Marshall Bullitt.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more. I have not had any time on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Now, here is another lawyer by the name of William Marshall Bullitt, and Mr. Schlesinger says of him:

I persuaded him to come to Washington at \$25,000 a year, which was a great financial sacrifice to him.

And I turn over to the list, and here is William Marshall Bullitt still working at \$11,000 per year since the limitation was put on. Before that he had to have \$25,000. Now he is willing to work at \$11,000.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Does the gentleman object to these men sacrificing their time and sacrificing a part of the emoluments which they might earn elsewhere?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Oh, not at all; but the irony of the gentleman's statement is that they make a sacrifice. I am accepting the testimony of the man that they need seventy-

odd lawyers, which is all the justification they have here; and he says these men would not come, and they could not get these men for \$20,000 and in some instances even for \$25,000 and \$30,000, but after they were hired at these high figures Congress forbade the payment of more than \$11,000 and all these sacrificial people still stuck.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. If the gentleman will yield for a further question?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I will.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Has the gentleman any information that these men did not make any sacrifice in coming here?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I have no information at all, but I say there should be information that they are earning the money. That is not here. I have not been able to find what these lawyers are now doing and as to the necessity for retaining them. And the hearings for this year do not disclose that information. It is not up to me to justify the elimination of these men. It is up to the Congress to eliminate some of them unless the Appropriations Committee justifies their retention. And I do not think this has been done.

It is not up to me to show that they are not making a personal sacrifice by rendering this service. It is up to those who are trying to justify them to show that they are earning what the Government pays them. I am not objecting to retaining some of these lawyers. What I want is to get the work done as cheaply and as efficiently as possible. I say this work could be done by 20 lawyers and 20 adjusters. Much of the work is such as could be done by an adjuster instead of by an attorney. It ought to be done at an aggregate cost of not exceeding \$200,000. We ought to be able to get attorneys and adjusters to do this work for that money.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

Mr. FESS. I sympathize with what the gentleman is trying to do, to bring this amount down to the limit of such service as we need. But the criticism may be somewhat unfair. Is it not true that we do have men in the Government service who are making a tremendous sacrifice?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes; I think so. But what I was saying is that these men have stayed on at a reduced salary when before their salary was reduced they protested that they could not come unless these high salaries were paid. They were accordingly employed at the high salaries. Oh, no; they could not come here for less than \$15,000 or \$20,000 or, in some instances, \$30,000. But, like the poor we seem to have them always with us, even at a much less rate of compensation.

Mr. MacLAFFERTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

Mr. MacLAFFERTY. I will ask the gentleman if he is not capable himself, as a lawyer, of earning more than \$625 a month, the salary of a Congressman? Does not the gentleman think so?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I am pretty well satisfied with the place I have. [Laughter.]

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

Mr. FESS. I understand that Mr. Lasker is not only sacrificing his business but has expended at least \$40,000 out of his own private purse in order to try to solve this problem.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Let me ask the gentleman a question in answer to his question.

Mr. FESS. Is it not possible that he has about him men who are devoted to trying to solve the problem and willing to make a personal sacrifice in doing so?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Most assuredly; but before the other limitation was made he had been spending large salaries to these men who could be employed for less. If they are willing to make a sacrifice now, surely they would have done it then. I say we ought to be able to get a corps of competent officers at a less total amount than is being paid.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Texas may proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask my colleague if it is not his sound judgment that what we term "dollar-a-year" men with reference to the Government service are not the most expensive men that we could have in any line of endeavor?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I think that is undoubtedly true. While I think there were some patriotic men who really rendered fine service at a dollar a year, yet I think the policy was a mistake, and in the end, on the whole, it cost more to have dollar-a-year men than to pay men what their services were worth. I am not objecting to adequate compensation to attorneys for adequate work, but I think that \$200,000, after a year when they had \$600,000, ought to be sufficient to take care of the legal department. Mr. Schlesinger in his testimony says:

I sent for Mr. Fairbanks and offered him \$10,000 a year to come with the board. He refused point-blank and told me he had been paid \$12,000 when he was at the head of the War Claims Board. I offered him \$15,000, and he said he would come.

Here is another man, by the name of Freund. I understand the meaning of that word is "friend." I read:

I have told you about Mr. Freund. He came from the firm of Sherman & Sterling. I took him from that firm and offered to pay him \$25,000, and in view of the limitation of \$11,000 salary which Congress imposed upon us, I feel badly for having done so. I think the Government should pay its attorneys what they are worth when they are unusually competent.

Mr. Freund is still on here at \$11,000 a year, although he was being paid \$25,000 before Congress limited these salaries. I cite this on the question of efficiency. I again repeat that they can take 20 attorneys and 20 adjusters and do this work efficiently. The evidence shows that most of their work is claims adjusting. You can take a number of adjusters and claim agents and take enough attorneys to pass on the legality of the claims and accomplish efficient results.

Here is another man, by the name of Aaron. That is a name to conjure with. Last year the gentleman from Indiana evidently had some misgivings as to the efficiency of all their work and the salaries paid. I want to quote from his question of Mr. Aaron. He asked:

Mr. WOOD. You elevated that gentleman to \$10,000 from a Government position at \$4,000?

Mr. SCHLESINGER. No, sir; he was engaged at \$10,000.

Mr. WOOD. He worked for the Government somewhere at \$4,000 a year.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] says that in 1919 this Mr. Aaron was working for the Government somewhere at \$4,000 a year. Mr. Schlesinger said he did not even know that.

Now, gentlemen of the House, we want to do the work of the Government properly and efficiently, but after they have had two years, with all these high-priced attorneys adjusting claims, practically all of which arose during the operation of the fleet and the work during and immediately after the war, it seems to me that \$200,000 for lawyers ought to be adequate and sufficient to take care of it. I do not know whether they will need that amount or not, but there ought at least to be some limitation on the amount. In view of the testimony here and in view of the amount that was paid to these attorneys prior to the time when the other limitation was put on the action of the Emergency Fleet Corporation and the Shipping Board, I am unwilling that they shall be given carte blanche to pay any amount they please for attorneys whom they may desire to employ. Under the terms of this bill they are unlimited so long as they do not pay over \$11,000 to any particular attorney. There is no limit fixed in the bill. There should be a limit placed on the total amount paid to the attorneys, and I have been unable to find any such limitation in the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Jones] had been here the other day, I dare say he would not have humiliated himself by the speech he has just made. If he had confined himself to the hearings of this year rather than of last year, from which he has quoted to-day, I know with due respect to himself he would not have made the speech that he has just made. True to form, he is just a year behind time. I wish to insert in the RECORD a list of the attorneys now employed and the salaries given:

List of consuls and attorneys in the employ of the United States Shipping Board and United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

Name.	Designation.	Salary.
Glen R. Snider.....	Admiralty counsel	\$7,500
C. A. MacDonald.....	do.	4,000
Walter L. Berry.....	Attorney	3,600
Arthur M. Boal.....	do.	3,900
Lawrence B. Evans.....	Special counsel	8,000
Edgar T. Feil.....	Attorney	3,600
Wm. R. Fitch.....	do.	3,900
Joseph H. Gaines.....	Assistant counsel	9,500
Chester J. Gerkin.....	Attorney	4,500
F. K. Hill.....	Nautical advisor	6,000
Jerry C. Massy.....	Attorney	3,600
Willis E. Monty.....	do.	3,600

List of consuls and attorneys in the employ of the United States Shipping Board, etc.—Continued.

Name.	Designation.	Salary.
W. W. Nottingham.....	Assistant counsel	\$6,000
E. M. Allison, Jr.....	Special counsel	11,000
Wm. Y. C. Anderson.....	Assistant counsel	6,500
Norman B. Beecher.....	Special counsel	11,000
O. P. M. Brown.....	Assistant counsel	5,000
Wm. M. Bullitt.....	Special counsel	11,000
W. D. Casey.....	Assistant counsel	3,000
Frederick R. Conway.....	Attorney	4,500
Geo. C. Cravey.....	Assistant counsel	5,000
Walter D. Davidge.....	do.	4,000
Roland S. H. Dyer.....	do.	6,500
John E. Fetzner.....	do.	7,500
S. H. E. Freund.....	General counsel	20,000
A. W. Graef.....	Assistant counsel	10,000
Wirt Howe.....	do.	5,000
Lake Jones.....	District counsel	6,000
Richard F. Jones.....	Assistant counsel	7,500
Paul Knox.....	do.	4,500
B. J. Laws.....	Assistant to general counsel	10,000
Harry Long.....	Assistant counsel	8,500
Chauncey G. Parker.....	General counsel	20,000
Caleb Powers.....	Assistant counsel	5,000
Alfred B. Quinton.....	do.	3,600
Wm. T. Sabine, Jr.....	do.	6,500
Wade H. Skinner.....	do.	4,500
Henry M. Ward.....	Special counsel	11,000
W. Worthingham.....	Assistant counsel	5,000
Gratton Colvin.....	do.	7,500
G. Raymond Conybeare.....	do.	5,000
A. W. De Goosch.....	do.	3,900
Joseph Fairbanks.....	Director of claims	11,000
Geoffrey Goldsmith.....	Assistant counsel	7,500
Ralph H. Hallett.....	do.	6,000
Allison M. Lederer.....	do.	8,000
John B. Milliken.....	do.	5,000
Mervyn Ap. Rice.....	do.	6,000
James Talbert.....	do.	10,000
E. H. Van Fossan.....	do.	9,000
H. P. Wood.....	do.	4,000
Frank V. Donegan.....	Examiner	2,700
A. M. Menkel.....	Assistant counsel	6,000
R. B. Romaine.....	do.	6,000
J. K. White.....	do.	6,000
R. S. Hume.....	do.	5,000
J. R. Stewart.....	do.	3,600
H. M. Gray.....	Admiralty attorney	7,500
J. Hunter.....	do.	5,000
Arthur Longfellow.....	do.	3,600
W. Schaffner.....	do.	3,000
W. B. Gray.....	do.	2,500
L. P. Scott.....	do.	2,500
Benn Barber.....	Counsel	7,500
J. C. Hawkins.....	Assistant counsel	3,500
Joseph McCormack.....	do.	6,000
T. H. Madigan.....	do.	4,500
M. H. Michaels.....	do.	2,400
A. H. Stetson.....	do.	4,000
J. E. Walker.....	Common law attorney	4,000
J. J. Dwyer.....	District counsel	6,000
MacCormac Snow.....	do.	6,000
L. E. Anderson.....	Legal advisor	5,000

I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that under the old régime, of which he was a defender, the pay roll of this board was more than twice what it is now. With very ill grace does it come from those who are now criticizing the Shipping Board to inveigh against exorbitant salaries, when but a few short years ago they were here defending them. One of the greatest compliments that could be paid Mr. Lasker, who has sacrificed his time and his possibilities of earning money to the interests of the Government, is the fact that he has reduced the overhead expense of this Shipping Board from \$15,861,000 down to \$7,500,000.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Is there any limitation in the bill which would keep him from employing any number of attorneys that he might desire?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Of course there is, and the gentleman simply shows his ignorance by not reading the bill.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I should like to be cited to that provision.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Your time is no more valuable than mine. Everybody else knows about it. Read the bill and you will find where it is.

Mr. JONES of Texas. That is a very general statement. I should like to have the information, and the gentleman as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations in charge of this bill ought to furnish that information.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The information is in the bill itself. Read the bill. You have not read the bill.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I have read the bill.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. You have just simply been employing your time in reading last year's hearings. And let me say to you—

Mr. JONES of Texas. That is a gratuitous statement. I tried to find it in this year's hearings, and I would like some information about it. I asked the ranking Democrat on the committee about these attorneys and he said he had no information, and the hearings disclose no information. I have looked at the hearings and the index, and there is nothing in the index about attorneys.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The gentleman is just simply further showing his ignorance, because there was no ranking Democrat on this committee, unfortunately.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I have asked the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], who was looking after it.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. You had better employ your time in reading the minutes of the hearings.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Surely it was not the purpose to have no Democrats on the committee. Surely there are Democrats on the subcommittee.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes; there were two. Unfortunately Mr. HARRISON did not serve, because of a personal embarrassment for which he was excusable, and Mr. GRIFFIN unfortunately has been sick. Fortunately Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee has been able and willing to act in their places in the presentation of this bill. But if the gentleman would simply be as industrious in trying to ascertain the facts as he is industrious in trying to insert a little bit of prejudice and acrimony into this debate, it would be far better for all concerned and infinitely better for the administration of affairs.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I appreciate the gentleman's lecture all right, but I should like to have the information. He has not disclosed it yet.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I have the information here now.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I should like to know the provision in the bill which places this limitation, and I should like to know the total amount to be used to pay attorneys.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I am going to insert the list in the RECORD, and the gentleman can read it at his leisure.

Mr. JONES of Texas. May I have the list? May I have time to look over the list?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Why, of course you can.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Will the gentleman in the meantime—

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I do not want you to be occupying my time. I want to give the House some facts.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I wish the gentleman would do it.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I am going to confine it to the present year and not past years. This thing of sitting backward in a car and waiting until you pass an object before you see it, and then criticizing it because you did not see it before, does not appeal much to me. [Laughter.] Now, the pay roll of this Shipping Board has gone from \$15,861,000, which was the amount when the present board came into office in 1921, down to \$7,500,000. This reduction keeps pace with the better liquidation of war entanglements.

Here is another thing to which I wish to call attention: We have done away with the very gentleman whom the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] has spoken about. Mr. Schlesinger is no longer connected with this board. Happily, he rendered a splendid service, and after he went away the position of general counsel of the Shipping Board and general counsel of the Emergency Fleet Corporation have been united, thus saving that \$10,000. They have also done away with two experts, saving \$10,000 each. In fact, they have done away in that department alone with personal services saving the Government some \$47,000 a year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. May I have three minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the time of the gentleman will be extended three minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I was a little bit amused here on yesterday to hear gentlemen on the other side criticizing the Shipping Board because they have found it expedient to do away with the commission for the settlement of claims. The members of that commission were costing us \$10,000 a year each, and some gentlemen who are now criticizing the board because they have done away with that service were then criticizing us who were recommending it. For the life of me I can not understand their consistency or their attitude unless it be simply for the purpose of criticism.

Now, gentlemen, I suppose I have had just as much trouble with this Shipping Board as anybody. I think I have had

more trouble. I was sent back five times last year to conference on this appropriation bill because of the appropriation for the Shipping Board. The items then in dispute have proven the very best things that could happen so far as saving is concerned, so far as reduction of overhead is concerned, so far as efficiency is concerned, and gentlemen upon the other side, some of them, are now free to admit that that is true.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Is it not a fact that in the gentleman's own list there are 73 lawyers now employed by the Shipping Board?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I think there are, and I want to say to you, as I said a year ago, that this is the biggest business in the world. There is nothing to compare with it. That is the trouble. There is nothing that we have to do that is comparable to the extent of the business of the Shipping Board. It extends all over the world. Some of us can not comprehend the extent of it. I confess I can not; but every port in the world has some representative of this Shipping Board involving, if you please, all the expenditures and trouble incident to shipping. I am not a shipper. I know but little about this business. All I know about it is the information I get from those who by reason of long experience are equipped to give information, and to my mind it is a most amazing proposition and wonderfully to the credit of the present Shipping Board that out of all the rottenness that formerly prevailed in this thing they have reduced it as they have been able to reduce it. And I wish to say to gentlemen upon this side that there will be no one happier than I when the United States will have done with this entire thing. It is not a business in which the Government ought to be engaged; but as long as she is engaged in it she must do the best she can to conserve the best interests not only as to the property that is in trust, but to all those who are vitally concerned. I wish that I might have the deciding voice in establishing a merchant marine for the United States to take this thing over, and if you gentlemen will be as honest and industrious in trying to do that thing for the pride and glory of the country as you are in criticizing the Shipping Board we soon will be rid of this thing, and happy will I be when it comes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] is chairman of this Appropriations Subcommittee. He admits on the floor of the House that only three members of Congress have had anything to do with the preparation of this bill. There are 432 other Members of Congress who had no connection whatever with the preparation of the bill, and may get information concerning it only from the hearings or the gentleman. He is presumed to answer questions as chairman of the subcommittee—questions that may be asked him concerning the provisions of the bill, and be frank about it. My colleague from Texas [Mr. JONES] can not be disposed of with a lip spanking such as the gentleman from Indiana sought to give him. He asked a legitimate question. He asked where in this bill was there such a limitation as he mentioned, and the chairman said:

It is there; you have not read the bill.

Mr. Chairman, it is not in the bill. I have read it carefully. The only provisions in the bill that limits the matter in any respect whatever are the two provisions on the top of page 35. The first provision reads as follows:

No part of the sums appropriated in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any attorney, regular or special, for the United States Shipping Board or the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation unless the contract of employment has been approved by the Attorney General of the United States.

That does not limit the number of attorneys.

Mr. LONGWORTH. What about the next paragraph?

Mr. BLANTON. I am coming to that, I will say to the gentleman from Ohio. The next paragraph merely provides that where you pay more than \$11,000 to an employee you can only employ six at \$25,000 and two at \$20,000. They are permitted to employ an unlimited number at not over \$11,000 each per annum. Let me read it to you:

No officer or employee of the United States Shipping Board or the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation shall be paid a salary or compensation at a rate per annum in excess of \$11,000 except the following: Six at not to exceed \$25,000 each, and two at not to exceed \$20,000 each.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In a moment. The point of my colleague [Mr. JONES] was that they were unlimited as to the number of attorneys they could employ at \$11,000 a year. The only limitation is to get the approval of the Attorney General of the United States. Now, I am with the Attorney General in enforcing the laws of this country. I am against the effort that

is being made to hamstring him in that enforcement. I approve of his stand against anarchy in the railroad strike. But I want to say that if you will look over the stupendous list of attorneys that are now employed by the Attorney General in the Department of Justice, you will see that we can not depend upon him to exert a proper limitation. Oh, concerning our two former colleagues, Mr. McCulloch and Mr. Reavis—both splendid gentlemen—they are earning every dollar of the \$10,000 that the Attorney General is now paying them. I commend the splendid work they are doing. They are both doing the best of service, highly valuable to the people, and if they were all like Mr. Reavis and Mr. McCulloch, I would not take the floor and say a word against them. They are earning it all. And some of the other attorneys are splendid men earning their salaries. But they have a bunch of lawyers there, some of whom are being paid about four times as much as they ever got before in their lives.

Mr. DICKINSON. Will the gentleman state who those attorneys are?

Mr. BLANTON. I will ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, in connection with my remarks about them, to put in the RECORD the list of the attorneys who are employed by the Department of Justice.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman include the name of ex-Senator Thomas among those he is indicting?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I will not.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman name the men that he is indicting now?

Mr. BLANTON. I will name some of them, and in such connection give facts that should indict them to the full satisfaction of the gentleman.

Mr. DICKINSON. Why not give them to us on the floor of the House?

Mr. BLANTON. I will put them in the RECORD and you will be surprised. I am going to put the names of the attorneys and the salaries in. I am going to show you that in addition to the number of attorneys whose salaries are fixed and stated there is a long list of them whose salaries are indeterminate.

Some of them, I presume, are being given the largest salaries. The following is a list of the 39 special attorneys employed by the Attorney General in the war-fraud cases, with their home State given, and the salary they draw, respectively:

Name and home State addresses of special attorneys employed by Department of Justice on war-fraud cases, and the salary they are now drawing.

Henry W. Anderson, Virginia	\$10,000
Alfred G. Armstrong, Kansas	4,000
T. M. Bigger, Ohio	10,000
Marcus W. Borchardt, Montana	3,500
Charles B. Brewer, Maryland	5,000
Arthur Canduff, Indiana	7,200
Wm. T. Chantland, Iowa	7,500
Leland B. Duer, New York	(1)
John W. H. Crim	(2)
Beverly Andrew Davis, Jr., Virginia	3,000
Paul S. Dodson, South Carolina	3,000
C. Leon Downing, Pennsylvania	4,000
Marion C. Early, Missouri	5,000
E. Donald Enfield, Nebraska	4,000
Richard Ratcliff Farr, Virginia	6,000
Geo. Pendleton Hoover, Maryland	10,000
Miller Hughes, Kentucky	3,000
Geo. E. Kelleher, Massachusetts	4,000
Charles Kerr, Kentucky	10,000
James J. Lenihan, Iowa	6,000
James N. Linton, Ohio	10,000
Robert E. McClure, Ohio	(3)
Roscoe C. McCulloch, Ohio	10,000
M. C. Masterson, California	3,500
John F. A. Merrill, Maine	(4)
Ralph E. Moody, Oregon	5,000
Paul J. Mullen	2,000
William M. Offey, New York	5,000
Harry E. O'Neill, Nebraska	5,000
Oliver E. Pagan, Illinois	(5)
C. Frank Reavis, Nebraska	10,000
Heber H. Rice, West Virginia	4,000
Henry A. B. Schwartz	2,740
Archie K. Shipe, Virginia	2,740
Meier Steinbrink, New York	10,000
J. A. Tellier	10,000
Charles S. Thomas, Colorado	10,000
W. R. Turner, District of Columbia (to be determined—not to exceed)	10,000
William S. Ward	4,000

¹ To be fixed. ² Expenses. ³ To be determined.

The following is a list of the attorneys regularly employed in the Department of Justice under Attorney General Daugherty, whose salaries are fixed, with their home State given. All those who do not receive more than \$2,500 per annum get an extra bonus of \$240 per year each:

Attorney's name.	Legal residence.	Designation.	Salary.
Harry M. Daugherty	Ohio	Attorney General	\$12,000
W. Frank Gibbs	do	Private secretary and assistant to Attorney General	3,000
Katherine M. Carroll	do	Assistant secretary to Attorney General	2,500
Mary Yeager	Indiana	do	2,500
Edith M. Watkins	Ohio	Special employee	2,000
Warren F. Martin	Pennsylvania	Special assistant to Attorney General	6,000
James M. Beck	New Jersey	Solicitor General	10,000
Blackburn Esterline	Illinois	Special assistant to Attorney General	6,000
William J. Hughes	Pennsylvania	do	5,000
W. M. Smith	Maryland	Assistant attorney	2,000
Robert P. Reeder	Pennsylvania	Attorney	3,500
Guy D. Goff	Wisconsin	Assistant to Attorney General	2,000
Oliver E. Pagan	Illinois	Special assistant to Attorney General	7,200
Herman J. Galloway	Indiana	do	6,000
Roger Shale	Missouri	do	5,500
J. J. Lenihan	Iowa	do	5,000
G. Stanley Thompson	Minnesota	do	4,200
Russell Hardy	District of Columbia	do	3,600
George E. Strong	Kansas	Special attorney	2,000
Miller Hughes	Kentucky	Attorney	3,000
Chester J. McGuire	Massachusetts	do	2,500
M. Ethel Tucker	District of Columbia	Assistant secretary	2,200
Harry T. Jones	New York	Law clerk	2,000
Thaddeus G. Benton	District of Columbia	do	1,800
George P. Alt	New York	Assistant examiner of titles	2,000
W. R. Loney	Maryland	Law clerk	2,000
Paul J. Mullen	Ohio	do	1,400
Henry A. Guiler	New York	Special assistant to Attorney General	6,000
John Weaver	Illinois	do	4,000
L. Ert Slack	Indiana	do	7,200
G. E. Kelleher	Massachusetts	do	4,000
R. Colton Lewis	Virginia	do	6,000
A. R. Johnson	Ohio	do	5,000
L. D. Vickers	West Virginia	do	4,000
Henry I. Foster	New Hampshire	do	3,600
Dean Hill Stanley	Ohio	do	4,200
Rush L. Holland	Colorado	do	7,500
J. Edgar Hoover	District of Columbia	do	4,500
Charles R. Frankham	Ohio	do	5,000
Robert H. Lovett	Illinois	do	7,500
J. Robert Anderson	West Virginia	do	5,000
Perry W. Howard	Mississippi	do	5,000
F. B. Crosthwaite	Michigan	do	5,000
Chas. F. Jones	Indiana	do	5,000
Fred K. Dyer	California	do	4,000
Barrett F. Brown	Ohio	do	2,500
Frank E. Scott	New York	do	4,000
John S. Bradley	do	do	3,600
Crowley Wentworth	do	do	3,000
Chas. B. Brewer	Maryland	Attorney	5,000
M. D. Church	District of Columbia	do	3,500
Percy M. Cox	Maryland	do	3,700
Howard W. Ameli	New York	do	3,750
Heber H. Rice	West Virginia	do	3,250
Leslie A. Smith	Indiana	do	3,000
J. E. Hoover	District of Columbia	do	3,000
William F. Norris	Nebraska	do	3,000
George T. Stormont	Michigan	do	3,000
Matt. L. Blake	Wyoming	do	3,000
John G. Ewing	Indiana	do	3,000
D. E. Rorer	do	do	2,500
J. F. Mothershead	New York	Assistant attorney	3,500
George H. Foster	Indiana	do	3,000
A. H. McCormick	Maryland	do	3,000
Leona E. Kidwell	Virginia	do	2,500
William D. Riter	Utah	Assistant Attorney General	7,500
David D. Caldwell	Illinois	Special assistant to Attorney General	5,000
W. W. Dyer	Maryland	do	5,000
H. L. Underwood	New York	Attorney	5,000
C. S. Easterling	Kansas	do	3,000
Austin Harveycutter	District of Columbia	Assistant attorney	2,750
Randolph S. Collins	Utah	do	2,500
Grace Murphy	Minnesota	Law clerk	2,000
Charles S. Lawrence	Tennessee	Attorney	5,000
Henry L. Gilbert	Michigan	do	3,000
Charles H. Jennings	Georgia	Assistant attorney	2,750
LeRoy L. Hight	Maine	do	2,500
Charles E. Jones	North Carolina	Special assistant to Attorney General	2,210
Joseph W. Howell	Oklahoma	do	3,500
Robert A. Hunter	Louisiana	do	6,000
Edwin C. Motter	Oklahoma	do	5,000
Oliver P. Morton	California	do	3,600
J. A. Tellier	Arkansas	do	7,500
John F. Truesdell	Colorado	do	7,200
Ethelbert Ward	do	do	4,500
Raymond Benjamin	California	do	7,500
C. D. Hamel	do	do	5,400
John A. Fain	Oklahoma	do	8,000
S. W. Williams	California	do	7,000
Robert O. Crockett	Virginia	do	3,500

¹ Per month.

Attorney's name.	Legal residence.	Designation.	Salary.
G. A. H. Fraser.....	Colorado.....	Special assistant to Attorney General.	\$5,000
R. E. Twitchell.....	New Mexico.....	do.....	6,000
W. C. Preus.....	Minnesota.....	do.....	1,800
Ester A. Olsen.....	do.....	Stenographer to Mr. Preus.	1,400
Albert Ottinger.....	New York.....	Assistant Attorney General.	7,500
H. B. Cox.....	Iowa.....	Attorney.....	3,000
H. T. Atkins.....	New York.....	Special assistant to Attorney General.	4,800
J. Frank Staley.....	Pennsylvania.....	do.....	6,500
John W. H. Crim.....	New York.....	Assistant Attorney General.	7,500
W. H. Ramsay.....	Ohio.....	Special assistant to Attorney General.	3,000
William C. Herron.....	do.....	Attorney.....	5,000
H. S. Ridgely.....	District of Columbia.....	do.....	4,500
Franklin G. Wixson.....	Michigan.....	do.....	3,000
Hugh A. Fisher.....	Maryland.....	do.....	3,000
Jerome J. Simmons.....	New York.....	Special assistant to Attorney General.	3,600
Mabel W. Willebrandt.....	California.....	Assistant Attorney General.	7,500
G. Noble Jones.....	Tennessee.....	Special assistant to Attorney General.	4,000
Howard T. Jones.....	Pennsylvania.....	do.....	2,750
John C. Hays.....	Iowa.....	Assistant attorney.....	2,400
John C. Dyott.....	Missouri.....	Special assistant to Attorney General.	4,500
Vance J. Higgs.....	do.....	do.....	1,300
H. R. Gamble.....	Texas.....	do.....	4,000
R. H. McCormick.....	California.....	do.....	4,500
C. W. Middlekauff.....	Illinois.....	do.....	6,000
Arthur H. Bartlett.....	Wisconsin.....	do.....	4,000
William W. Hoppin.....	New York.....	Assistant Attorney General.	8,000
Charles D. Lawrence.....	do.....	Special attorney and counselor at law.	5,000
Samuel Isenschmid.....	do.....	do.....	4,000
George F. Lamb.....	do.....	do.....	4,500
John J. Mulvaney.....	New Jersey.....	do.....	4,000
Bernard Edelherz.....	New York.....	do.....	(9)
Harry M. Farrell.....	Illinois.....	do.....	3,500
John G. Lerch.....	New York.....	do.....	3,500
P. St. George Bissell.....	do.....	do.....	4,000
Marcus J. Higgenbotham.....	do.....	do.....	4,000
David Hyams.....	do.....	do.....	4,000
Francis M. Keightley.....	do.....	Special employee.....	3,000
Lucien Swindell.....	Maryland.....	do.....	1,800
Thos. H. Baughman.....	District of Columbia.....	Special agent.....	\$10 per day.
James E. Amos.....	do.....	do.....	\$7 per day.
George F. Ruch.....	do.....	do.....	\$10 per day.
W. W. Grimes.....	Virginia.....	do.....	\$9 per day.
Walter O. McQueen.....	South Dakota.....	do.....	3,000
C. L. Keep.....	California.....	do.....	\$8 per day.
Harrie D. Knickerbocker.....	New York.....	do.....	\$6 per day.
Harry C. Heckman.....	Pennsylvania.....	Assistant attorney.....	2,500
James A. Finch.....	New York.....	Attorney in charge.....	3,600
Robt. H. Turner.....	Virginia.....	Attorney.....	3,000
Rufus W. Pearson.....	Tennessee.....	do.....	2,500
Joseph P. Rudy.....	Pennsylvania.....	Law clerk.....	1,800
George Kearney.....	Virginia.....	do.....	2,000
Clarkson R. Sherwood.....	Rhode Island.....	Assistant attorney in charge.....	2,000
Arthur Robb.....	Kansas.....	Attorney in charge.....	3,000
Fred E. Manning.....	Ohio.....	Special employee.....	2,250
Eugene D. Carusi.....	District of Columbia.....	do.....	1,800
Chas. S. Geotz.....	New York.....	do.....	\$6 per day.
John G. Townsend.....	Illinois.....	Law clerk.....	2,000
Herbert E. Collins.....	Georgia.....	do.....	2,000

1 Per case.

\$11.11 per day when employed.

I have had quite a hard time getting the above. Some I got from our colleague from New York [Mr. HUSTED], who is chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee in charge of the Department of Justice appropriations, and the others I got from the Department of Justice after some effort. The following is a list of the attorneys who are designated as special assistants to the Attorney General in the Department of Justice, and whose salaries are not definitely fixed; but the department has promised in a few days to furnish me with data showing amounts paid them annually:

NAMES OF SPECIAL ASSISTANTS TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL AND THEIR LEGAL RESIDENCE.

Henry M. Glassie, Maryland.
 James A. Fowler, Tennessee.
 Frank K. Nebeker, Utah.
 Elias Field, Massachusetts.
 LaRue Brown, Massachusetts.
 B. I. Salinger, Iowa.
 Luke D. Stapleton, New York.
 John Marshall, West Virginia.
 Frederic N. Watriss, New York.
 V. W. Van Fleet, Indiana.
 H. C. Workman, New York.
 Harry E. Knight, New Jersey.
 Robert S. Blair, New York.
 Thomas B. Booth, Massachusetts.
 J. Edgar Bull, New York.
 H. H. Byrne, District of Columbia.
 Arthur E. Dowell, District of Columbia.
 Osgood H. Dowell, Illinois.
 Clifton V. Edwards, New York.

Frederick L. Emery, Massachusetts.
 Ramsey Hoguet, New York.
 A. M. Holcombe, District of Columbia.
 Andrew W. Hunter, Canada.
 H. Alfred Janke, New York.
 Lawrence A. Janney, Illinois.
 Louis A. Jones, Massachusetts.
 Herbert H. Knight, District of Columbia.
 Octavius Knight, New York.
 Lawrence G. Miller, Massachusetts.
 Maurice Orgais, Paris, France.
 Edward H. Palmer, Massachusetts.
 T. K. Schmuck, New York.
 John W. Thompson, New York.
 Thomas J. Tyne, Tennessee.
 Lucius E. Varney, New York.
 Manvel Whittemore, New York.
 Robert H. Young, District of Columbia.
 James A. Watson, District of Columbia.
 Daniel L. Morris, New York.
 Carl P. Goepel, New York.
 W. L. Toozee, Oregon.
 Howell Van Auker, Michigan.
 Chas. A. McDonough, Philippine Islands.
 A. R. Holden, Canada.
 Stuart R. Bolin, Ohio.
 Joseph B. Fleming, Illinois.
 John E. Northrup, Illinois.
 J. Sherring Pratt, Ohio.
 Harold Harper, New York.
 W. H. Boyd, Ohio.
 D. M. Kelleher, Iowa.
 Gordon Auchincloss, New York.
 Bert Hanson, New York.

Now, I was asked to give concrete cases of some of these attorneys who are overpaid. Mr. James J. Lenihan is one of them. According to his own statement, before coming to Washington to accept this position, his income for the preceding two years was not in excess of \$75 per month, I am reliably informed, and that he has admitted that he had never tried a case in the Federal court. If the membership of this body will examine closely into his services with regard to the United States Harness Co. case, the Kenyon case, the Philipps & Stephens Lumber case, and the Maxwell case, you will reach the conclusion I have formed, that he has no business being employed by this Government in the Department of Justice. Yet Mr. Lenihan has been promoted and is now drawing \$6,000 per year.

On September 10, 1910, Mr. George E. Kelleher was appointed special agent in the Department of Justice at \$4 per day, and on February 1, 1912, was given \$4.50 per day, and is now paid \$4,000 per annum.

I am reliably advised that Mr. Abram F. Myers was a messenger boy in the department a few years ago.

I am reliably informed that Mr. Marcus W. Borchardt and Mr. William S. Ward were formerly special agents, and were taken in as war-fraud attorneys by Mr. Lenihan.

Concerning Mr. Ralph E. Moody, who is now being paid \$5,000 per year, I am reliably informed by Mr. Gilbert and Mr. James Shea, managers in charge of the Bliss properties with office adjoining the Driscoll Hotel, that some 15 months ago Mr. Moody rented an apartment from them in the Woodward apartment building on Connecticut Avenue and lived there under immoral conditions.

Failing to pay two months rent, the Bliss properties sued him, and on February 17, 1922, recovered judgment against Moody for \$300, which afterwards he paid. But he was told to move.

Messrs. Shea and Gilbert are substantial credible citizens of Washington, and if what they say is true, Mr. Ralph E. Moody is making no patriotic sacrifice in working for this Government at \$5,000 per annum, but ought to be separated from the Department of Justice.

We remember that Attorney General Daugherty criticized his predecessor for paying one of his attorneys \$24,000. Yet I am reliably informed that for one attorney he is now paying \$12,000 a year for half time. That is the same as \$24,000 a year for full time. But there is no such thing as half time for an attorney. How are you going to regulate half time? I want to say that the question raised by my colleague [Mr. JONES] is one that will not down. It is like Banquo's ghost. You can not dismiss it by getting up here and trying to lip-spank him for asking the question. Be frank about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words with reference to the question of the employment of attorneys by the Department of Justice, whose compensation is to be determined. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] makes a great point about this method of employment, and wants the

House to believe that it is extravagant and unbusinesslike. Now, the contrary is true. These attorneys in the Department of Justice whose compensation remains to be determined are chiefly employed in defending the Government in suits for the appropriation of patents or suits for the infringement of patents. They are men who in their own private practice command very large fees. They are men whose fees in their own private practice run to \$100,000 a year, \$150,000 a year, or \$200,000 a year in some instances. They are among the best patent lawyers in the country, and they are employed by the Department of Justice under contract. These contracts provide that they can not receive more than \$1,000 for any one month; that they can not receive more than \$12,000 in any one year; and they can not receive \$1,000 a month unless they present bills to the Department of Justice showing that they have rendered services for that month which, in the opinion of the Attorney General, are worth \$1,000. Their services are rendered under contracts where the salary remains to be determined, because it can not be fixed without loss to the Government. If it were fixed, it certainly would not be fixed at less than \$12,000 a year, and very few of these men get \$12,000 a year. On the average, I do not believe they get more than half of \$12,000 a year, and if we had any other method of providing for their compensation, it would cost the Government a great deal more than it does now. There is not an attorney employed in the Department of Justice who receives a salary of more than \$12,000 a year, and when you consider the importance of the business they handle, the gravity of the questions, and the vast amount of money involved in the litigation, I think the Government of the United States is served by its attorneys at much less cost than any public or private interest in the United States.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUSTED. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Has the gentleman any reply to the opinion expressed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], that in his view these men are getting four times what they are worth?

Mr. BLANTON. Some of them, I said.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Very well. Some of them. Will the gentleman indicate in his remarks which of them gets four times more than they are worth?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I will do that.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The gentleman is going to set himself up as the censor of the attorneys in the Department of Justice.

Mr. BLANTON. No; but I shall take the salaries that they received when they entered the Government service.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana did me the honor to say that I am in charge of the bill on this side of the Chamber. I was, however, not a member of the subcommittee, and, therefore, did not participate in the hearings on this particular bill. In fact, there were no Members on this side of the Chamber who participated in those hearings, on account of the illness of the Democratic members of the subcommittee.

My position with reference to the employment of attorneys in the Shipping Board, I think, is pretty well known by some of the Members present. I had something to say upon the subject a year ago when this bill was under consideration, and I think the year before that. A year ago something over \$600,000 was being spent for attorneys in the Shipping Board. The list which has been furnished the House by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] shows that there are now upon the pay roll of the Shipping Board 73 attorneys, who are drawing an aggregate of \$455,000 a year. It has been stated by the chairman of the Shipping Board that the claims against the Shipping Board have been practically settled, and that by July 1 all of the claims against the Shipping Board, with the exception of a very few where the claimants prefer to go into the Court of Claims, will have been settled, and that out of the \$50,000,000 appropriated to pay those claims he expects to pay back into the Treasury something like \$25,000,000. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I do not see any justification for an immense roll of attorneys next year, beginning on July 1, in the Shipping Board, with these claims out of the way. Why do they need so many attorneys down there? Why do they need so many attorneys employed all the way from \$3,600 to \$10,000 a year? I notice on this list the name of one distinguished gentleman who is now serving as an attorney, and who was employed at the beginning of this administration, as the general counsel stated in response to questions in the hearings of last year, solely for the purpose of appearing before the proper legislative committees of the House and Senate. He is down there now at a salary of \$9,500 per year, with no other duties,

according to the general counsel in his statement of a year ago, than to come before the committees of the House and the Senate upon legislation affecting the merchant marine. In view of the record of the Shipping Board with reference to the employment of attorneys, I submit that this House ought to place some limitation upon the Shipping Board and limit the amount of money that may be expended in the employment of high-salaried attorneys who want to come to Washington, some of them, for the purpose of engaging in social activities.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I think some of them want to come here to take a law course at the George Washington University or out here at the Georgetown University.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not know that that is the fact, but I am not prepared to dispute the statement of the gentleman. Ordinarily I am opposed to limitations upon appropriations for specific services for specific purposes; but I think the record of the Shipping Board, as disclosed in the hearings of a year ago, is such that this is entirely justified in the interest of the people of the country, and that we should put a limitation upon this bill and provide that no more than a certain amount shall be expended in the employment of attorneys. I repeat the question, What reason is there for the Shipping Board to keep this immense roll of attorneys if all of the claims against the board will be settled by the time that this appropriation goes into effect, July 1 next?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I am interested in what the gentleman says, but I did not hear all that he said. Did I understand the gentleman to say that it is stated by Mr. Lasker, or by those in authority, that the necessity for the employment of all of these men will expire on the 1st of July next?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Oh, no; I did not make that statement.

Mr. BUTLER. I am not trying to put anything into the gentleman's mouth, but I am trying to learn what is in his mouth. I want to know. Is it true that these claims will have been all settled by July 1 next?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. With the exception of a few that may possibly go to the Court of Claims because the claimants are unwilling to accept the amount which the Shipping Board is willing to pay in satisfaction of their claims. Unfortunately the hearings of this year are entirely silent upon the subject of attorneys. There is nothing in the hearings to show how many attorneys are employed, how many are expected to be employed, next year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. SEARS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. SEARS. If I understood the gentleman correctly, he stated that one of these lawyers got \$9,500 a year whose sole duty it was to appear before the subcommittee of the House and the committees of the Senate and help to get legislation through. Is that correct?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Well, I did not exactly put it that way. I do not know what his duties are now.

Mr. SEARS. I mean a year ago.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do know that in the hearings on the bill which was passed for the present fiscal year the general counsel stated, when asked what that particular attorney's duties were, that his duties were to appear before committees of the House and Senate on matters of legislation affecting the Shipping Board and its interests.

Mr. SEARS. Then if that is true the taxpayers are paying for a lobbyist to appear before committees to get legislation through.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not know whether you would call him a lobbyist. I do not know whether he is simply appearing there to give his legal opinion upon bills pending before the committee, but I submit with the limited number of bills which are pending affecting the Shipping Board and the Emergency Fleet Corporation that \$9,500 per annum is a pretty good sum to pay an attorney for that particular service.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. BUTLER. I understand they had an appropriation of over \$600,000 to pay attorneys to do certain work last year.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That was not a specific appropriation, but that amount was available.

Mr. BUTLER. That amount was available last year. The work is now practically accomplished, or will be by the 1st of July. I confess I do not see the necessity—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not question but what the Shipping Board will need attorneys during the year 1924.

Mr. BUTLER. Some attorneys.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They need a number of attorneys according to the statement of General Counsel Schlesinger a year ago, as I recall it, and a majority of attorneys then employed were engaged in considering these claims and passing upon them.

Mr. BUTLER. How many of these attorneys, and how much money was expended in their employment upon these claims? Because if they are about adjusted I confess I would want some one to explain it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am sorry I can not tell the gentleman, because I have no information. The hearings do not disclose it.

Mr. LITTLE. If the gentleman will yield, as I understand the information that comes to me, they have employed a gentleman to advise the Congress, and they pay him \$2,000 more than they pay a Congressman. Does not the gentleman think any man who has such a responsibility should be paid better than a Congressman to advise us? If he is not worth more than we are, he had better stay away.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am not quite in accord with the gentleman in the estimate he places upon himself.

Mr. YATES. Another reflection upon us.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. KINCHELOE. This row comes up every time this subject is opened about the number of attorneys employed by the Shipping Board, which we all agree and know is an outrage, and I was wondering why the Committee on Appropriations does not function and cut off some of the salaries of these fellows. That will get them out. I am asking for information purely.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The House last year adopted a provision which fixed the maximum salary and, of course, that limitation has not been exceeded by the Shipping Board at the present time. But this appropriation is made by lump sum, as the gentleman knows, and there is no restriction upon the chairman of the Shipping Board as to the number of attorneys he may employ under this appropriation.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I was wondering, if it appears patent on its face that this Shipping Board is not going to need 73 lawyers next year, whether Congress in some way should not take it from under the autocratic power of the Shipping Board?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is what I am pleading for now, and I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, which limits the sum to \$300,000, will be adopted. I think if the facts were fully known that is too much.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] stated that he was in sympathy with the gentleman from Texas, but. Usually when we try to economize on the floor of the House we are in sympathy, but. Of course, when it becomes necessary to cut the salary of some employee we sympathize, but. We forget the American people who are paying the freight. My good friend from Indiana I think was rather unfair when he referred to the Democratic side as being inconsistent now. In 1917 I made the statement on the floor of this House that the Democratic Party, which was then in power, should check up expenditures and stop graft and wanton waste of money and not wait until the Republican Party came into power. My good friend, the late lamented James R. Mann, differed with me and said when the Republicans came into power they would attend to that, and I remarked it was too late after the horse got out of the stable to check up; that the money would be gone. For more than four years the Republicans have been in control of the House and Senate. You can not get away from the fact; you know that is true. The American people are getting tired of wanton waste of money. The American people are moaning and groaning and staggering under a burden of taxation that they can not much longer bear.

For four years I have made a fight against the Shipping Board, whether it was a Democratic Shipping Board or a Republican Shipping Board. I am here fighting for economy for the people and it is immaterial to me whether my party is in power or whether the Republican Party is in power. The gentleman well knows that ever since this bill has been up before the House I have been trying to cut down the appropriations. There is but one thing in this bill that limits it. The only limitation is we are no longer willing to trust ourselves. I was elected by a great constituency, each of you were elected by a great constituency, and yet we leave it to the

Attorney General of the United States as to how many attorneys he shall employ and what salaries he shall pay each of them, except six shall receive an amount not to exceed \$25,000 each and two at not to exceed \$20,000 each and the rest to receive a salary not to exceed \$11,000 each. To my mind, at least, these amounts can not be defended.

If Congress would exercise its rights, if you would perform your functions that the people send you here to perform and quit delegating powers to people who are not elected to office, then the American people would once more have confidence in those whom they send to Washington to represent them. I care not whether it is on this side or on that side. If you ride the trains and talk to the people you will find my statement is correct, that they are getting tired of our saying that you can not hire a lawyer to do something for less than \$25,000 a year, when such a man as the chairman of the subcommittee himself [Mr. Wood], who is chairman of the Republican National Committee, is willing to serve his people for \$7,500 a year. The people are going to express their opinion upon this amount that you are appropriating, and whether it is on this side or on that side you will find they will demand of Congress that we do what they have sent us here to do—reduce taxation, simplify the form of taxation, and cut down the excessive expenditure of Government money throughout the country, which no one can deny is being done and which no one can defend. [Applause.]

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the committee to the fact that the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Jones] is purely an arbitrary proposition, without rhyme, reason, or sense. The gentleman could not give any details as to the necessities of his amendment. This appropriation, whatever it may be, is paid out of the general appropriation of \$50,000,000 for the administration of this service.

Now, it is true that they have been making very marked progress with reference to the settlement of these claims, and the hearings disclose that it is expected by the last of June that the claims will all be settled, and with the settlement of these claims all these lawyers that have to do with them will go out and, of course, nothing will be paid to them thereafter.

But here is the thing to consider: Before we interfere with the administration of these gentlemen we ought to have some reason for it. This money will not be wasted, and the best evidence that it will not be wasted is the fact of the return that is being made through the economical administration of this Shipping Board.

Members say there is no limitation fixed in this bill. There is a limitation in it by which not to exceed six people shall be employed at a salary of \$25,000. They are employing only four now. They might employ two more. As I stated before, they have dispensed with some of their high-priced attorneys and are getting along without their services. I think it is only fair to those who have charge of the administration of this work to let them alone. Why do we want to throw a monkey wrench into the machinery when the machinery is running smoothly, simply because gentlemen get up here and inveigh against an activity that was unpopular heretofore and rotten heretofore from core to rind? That rottenness has been reduced, constantly reduced. Why do you want to handicap the work? At the same time you are trying to handicap the work you are trying to prevent, if you please, the absolute wiping out of it. We on this side are trying to get rid of it and are trying to get rid of it in the best possible way. We had better sell an uncrippled operation than a crippled operation.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. It has been stated here this morning that there is nothing in the hearings to show the number of attorneys provided here, to wit, 73, or what salary they are receiving, and that there is nothing by which we can arrive at the lump sum of \$450,000. I was wondering how you arrived at that figure if that is true.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. We do not fix any definite sum. The amount that the gentleman refers to is the amount that we would pay these men until the end of the year. If they were employed until the end of the year, it will involve that expenditure. If they are not employed until the end of the year, the amount will be reduced.

Now, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE] says there is nothing in the hearings to show—

Mr. KINCHELOE. I said a statement was made to that effect. I do not know.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The trouble is that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Jones] has read the wrong hearings. He read the hearings of last year instead of the hearings of this year.

There are over a thousand cases pending, if you please, in the various courts of the United States, some in the smaller courts, and some in the Supreme Court of the United States. The fact is there are 1,202 cases pending, and they involve in amount \$118,000,000.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Where is that?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. In the hearings.

Mr. BUTLER. How many cases did the gentleman say are pending?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. On November 1, 1922, there were 1,028 cases pending in the law courts of the United States.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman from Indiana yield to me for a question or two?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. I thank the gentleman very much. Let me say in passing that of all the men in the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] I know as very careful men and economists, and when they differ, when I am tempted to lose confidence in both of you, there is something of a flare-up. How many cases are there pending?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. One thousand and twenty-eight.

Mr. BUTLER. Those cases will not be disposed of by July next? They can not be, of course?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I expect that most of those cases will not be disposed of, because of the fact that these are litigated cases. These cases, however, will be disposed of eventually if they are not handicapped.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The Shipping Board has already settled claims amounting to more than \$79,000,000 for \$18,000,000 in cash and kind; about \$8,000,000 in cash and \$9,000,000 plus in kind. There are \$57,000,000 of claims yet pending, which they expect to settle before the 1st of June. If they succeed in doing that, there will, of course, be no necessity for keeping the men who are settling these claims and they will go out automatically; but we can not tell whether it is going to take this many dollars or that many dollars. If the gentleman had some scheme whereby he could figure out, or if we could figure out, how many dollars it is going to take, that would be a different matter; but simply to arbitrarily cut this pay roll in two without any rhyme or reason is unfair and should not be authorized.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I made the statement that there was nothing in the hearings to show the number of attorneys and their salaries.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman refers to the number of cases pending, shown in a little table at the bottom of page 322. That shows the number of cases pending and the amounts involved.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It does not contradict the statement I made. But I want to ask the gentleman, is it not a fact that more than half the attorneys down there are employed in the settlement of these claims?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Oh, no.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Then what do they do?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will tell you what they are doing. One of the greatest troubles we have had, and that I tried to make plain a year ago, was in the lack of attorneys experienced in the prosecution and settling of these admiralty cases. There are a great many of these cases, involving a very large amount of money.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. How many admiralty cases are there?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I think that was shown in the last year's hearings. I do not know that they are segregated here.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There is nothing here to show.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No; but I will say to the gentleman that they comprise more than half of the litigated cases, and these attorneys have to go up against the best attorneys in the United States. They tell me that admiralty attorneys are the highest paid attorneys in the United States.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. It does not import anything to tell us that there are 1,000 cases pending. The dockets of many of the United States district courts show as many or more than 1,000 cases pending. The difficulty suggested by my friend from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] is that we have no specific information, and we have been trying to get it for two or three years.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I do not believe the gentleman means that. If he will revert to the hearings that we had, to which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] referred, those hearings show the number of admiralty cases, the number of common-law cases, and how they are divided.

Now, I will say to the gentleman that because of the shortage of time and because we are trying to expedite business here we did not encumber this record with facts that we thought were familiar to the Members of the House.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. If I may say it respectfully to my friend from Indiana, I think we ought to have the facts. I think that is important enough for this bill to go back so that the facts may be ascertained. It seems to me it is the most extraordinary thing I ever heard of that there are 73 attorneys employed in the transaction of business and that we hardly know what the business is.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. If the gentleman had some idea of the volume of this business, he would understand that these cases extend to every port in the United States and all over the world. These litigated cases are constantly arising, every time a boat puts into a port, with reference to some claim.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BUTLER. I appreciate what the gentleman says. I find in looking at this list that there are perhaps 8 or 10 admiralty lawyers employed, and their salaries are very low. I do not understand that. There are 40 assistant counsel. I would like to know what these gentlemen are engaged in doing. I am not having any dispute with my friend from Indiana, but the natural inquiry comes to me, as it will to the rest of us, as to what they are doing.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. They are engaged in trying these admiralty suits, 1,028 of them, scattered all over the coast cities of the United States. These admiralty cases naturally follow the coast towns and ports all around this country, clear from San Francisco to Boston, and all over Europe as well.

Mr. BUTLER. Will there be a reduction in these expenses this summer?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Of course there will be, and this administration has shown such splendid management of these affairs that we had better leave them to their own discretion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I would not have undertaken to speak again except for the rather vicious statement that my friend from Indiana chose to make with reference to what he was pleased to term my lack of information on this subject. I admit that there are some things about it that I do not know and do not understand; but it developed in the course of the debate here that every statement I had made was borne out by the facts, and that the criticisms which I made were just. I referred to the limitation on page 35, which says that not more than six employees shall be paid \$25,000 each, and that no one else shall be paid more than \$11,000. I said I was unable to find anywhere else in the bill any limitation, and that I was unable to find in the bill any limitation whatever as to the total amount allowed for attorneys. So far as any limitation is concerned, a hundred lawyers might be employed. Contrary to the gentleman's statement, I have read the bill, but I do not find any limitation as to the total amount that may be paid for attorneys, and if any gentleman here can point out any such limitation, I would like to have him rise in his place and state it.

Again, I stated here that I was unable to find anything in the hearings this year with reference to the kind of work these lawyers were doing, as to the number of lawyers, and as to the salaries which they were being paid. I asked the gentleman from Indiana courteously for the information, and he said I ought to read the hearings of this year instead of the hearings of last year. I again ask him or anyone else to rise on the floor of the House and show where the hearings give that information. There is none. The little exhibit on page 322 shows the number of claims that are pending, but it does not give the information sought. That is all I have been able to find, and there is nothing in the index showing the information for which I have asked.

I always try to be frank and fair with the House. I have always tried to speak to the facts when I undertook to quote testimony about facts, and I resent any imputation like that which has been made by the gentleman here, especially when he stands in his place and fails to furnish the House the information. I want to say to him that I have the right to my free opinion, and I would like to see any man take it away from me.

I again make the assertion that there is absolutely nothing that I have been able to find in the hearings and nothing has

been said here in the 40 minutes of discussion that shows what these attorneys are doing, but it has developed in the discussion that there are 73 on the pay roll. However, this was not published in the hearings. When we raised that question last year I had a similar amendment that I offered then. During the discussion upon that amendment they said, "Do not cut down the salaries now, for the most of these claims will be disposed of within one year and we will have the matter adjusted." Now it comes up this year. I will tell you why I want the limitation put on. We put a limitation on the amount of the salaries when they were paying \$25,000 and \$35,000—we put on a limit of \$11,000. Thus we have the limitation as to the amount they can pay any one of the individuals, but we have no limitation as to the total amount that may be used for the purpose of employing attorneys. Surely this limitation, in view of the evidence we have here, should be placed on this measure. This is a time for economy and limitation on expenditures wherever possible. This is no time to take the bridle off and let the horse run wild.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to make a statement to the gentleman from Indiana: That I hope if he reports the next bill he will be able to give us the information we are calling for, so that we will know what reductions can be made and know what are the services being performed by these men.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. Mr. Chairman, I want to say in a general way that I have always regarded these high salaries as inexcusable and unjustifiable extravagance and legislative profligacy. I do not believe for a moment that it is necessary to pay in the public service salaries of \$25,000 or \$35,000 per annum in order to secure an efficient and able attorney. I am not a lawyer, but I know the lawyers in this country, and many of them have admitted to me in confidence and with great modesty that they were good lawyers. [Laughter.] The country is full of them. Many of these men have been advanced from lower positions in this same bureau. I have no haunting fear that if we cut the salaries to \$12,000 that any of them will resign, or at least certainly they will not all resign. I have wondered a good many times if these are the only good men that can be secured among the thousands and thousands of not only admittedly good lawyers but known to be good lawyers. This is a foolish precedent for us to establish now.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me inconceivably preposterous that the representatives of this great Government at the courts of Europe, at European capitals, are being paid \$10,000 a year, that the able Mr. Reavis, a former Member of this House from Nebraska, than whom I think there has been no abler attorney in this House at any time since I have been here, shall be working efficiently, as it is said he is by every Member of this House, for \$10,000 a year in the Department of Justice, and we are here voting salaries of \$25,000 to attorneys for the Shipping Board. I know the spell that the chairman of the committee casts over the minds of the Members of this House, like the great Brougham of England, who spoke so convincingly that when he had finished stopped as if he had yet in reserve a great reserve of argument to influence his hearers by magic of the mind.

There is one issue before the American people, and that is economy. The wonderful, appealing, smooth, persuasive voice of the able chairman does not extend to the whole country, and they are not impressed as are the Members of the House. The burning issue before the American people is economy. [Applause.] Economy through retrenchment, which is recommended by the President of the United States. Let us work along these lines.

Gentlemen, I read a story many years ago—and this is the first one I have told in the House. It was in the days when the high god spoke to his prophets face to face, and one old prophet had become discouraged; he thought he was the only righteous man left and that all the others had fled from the presence of the king, but he was informed that he was badly mistaken, that there were yet 7,000 left.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I would like two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Gentlemen, we have set the example, and it seems to be easy to follow under the magic influence of the committee. I can think of no more tremendous power that has ever been exerted upon the House than the influence of this great committee reporting such a bill, unless it may be the

power and influence of the department, which has first been exercised upon the committee in order to justify the report.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the gentleman from Indiana referred to the work that has been done. Yes; that was done by the Claims Commission. During the period they served they settled \$79,000,000 worth of claims for something over \$8,000,000, and those settlements were accepted by the claimants. But in the face of that the Shipping Board entered an order, a copy of which I have, by which they discontinued this Claims Commission, effective January 1 last, and that order stated that it was done for the reason, the basis of the discontinuance was the fact, that the work of the commission in settling these claims had been practically completed. It was explained by the gentleman from Indiana that the reason of the discontinuance of the Claims Commission was that all the controverted questions had been settled and that they had reached the place where the remaining claims could be quickly settled. This bill itself proceeds on the theory that all claims will be settled before July 1 next, because it provides for a return to the Treasury of the balance of the \$50,000,000 appropriated for the payment of claims which remains unexpended and uncommitted on the 1st day of next July, and the chairman of the subcommittee explained that the reason for this was that the claims would be disposed of by then. Appropriations are made for the current fiscal year to cover these attorneys and all of their expenses up until July 1. That being true, tell me what is the necessity for continuing them in the appropriation for the next fiscal year, after these claims will all have been settled? [Applause.] Furthermore, the chairman of the Shipping Board stated at the hearings on the ship subsidy bill that when these claims were settled, which would probably be done, he said, within a year, and that statement was made last April, they would be able to cut off a large expense, because it would cut off the attorneys assigned to this work and also the large number of auditors and experts and assistants who were engaged in that work. They come along now and make the same appropriation of \$50,000,000, a lump-sum appropriation, for the next fiscal year, without taking any of those things into consideration. As a matter of fact, the expenses of the Shipping Board, all expenses and losses and everything, for the first 11 months of 1922 were less than \$31,000,000. On that basis, assuming that there will be no economy and no cutting down of expense for the next year, an appropriation of \$35,000,000 will be ample. Why are they asking for this appropriation if they do not intend to keep those officers in power? As was brought out by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], of these seventy-odd lawyers only eight or ten are admiralty lawyers or engaged in the disposition of admiralty suits. The gentleman from Indiana referred to cases pending in the different United States district courts. It is the official duty of the various district attorneys in those different courts to represent and protect and look after the interest of the Government in all suits to which the Government is a party. There is absolutely no excuse for continuing this large force of attorneys and for continuing the large appropriation that is carried. [Applause.]

My colleague from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] calls attention to the statement of Chairman Lasker as reported in the hearings, as follows:

We established, as you gentlemen know, a claims commission, of which Judge Walter D. Meals, of Cleveland, was the head. That commission will cease to function after the 31st day of this month. The commission has done invaluable work in establishing principles of settlement. The most difficult thing in making a settlement is to get a series of principles established that will be the basis of all settlements. After that it becomes a matter of accountancy and expert knowledge to apply those principles. The claims commission has heard every class of cases possible and it has established all principles.

I respectfully submit that if we are to economize, if we are to stop this enormous Shipping Board expense, the proper way to do it is to cut out these high-priced, useless officials and employees and quit charging up that waste and extravagance to an alleged loss in the operation of ships. [Applause.]

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] is speaking about the wasteful extravagance of this Shipping Board. If he would simply hark back to the time when he was defending the wasteful extravagance of another Shipping Board, I think he would be ashamed to offer himself as an apologist at this time.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No; I do not. The trouble about this amendment is that there is no rhyme or reason to it. It will just arbitrarily cut this expense. When these accounts are settled about which this gentleman is talking in approbation and against which he fought a year ago these men will go out, but we have 1,028 claims pending in admiralty and civil law

courts all over the United States, and yet these gentlemen, without any investigation, are offering this arbitrary amendment in order to cripple this thing. It ought not to be done.

I move that debate upon this amendment do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES].

The question was taken; and on a division (because the Chair was in doubt) there were—ayes 41, noes 51.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

No part of the funds appropriated or made available in this act for the United States Shipping Board or the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation shall be expended for the preparation, printing, publication, or distribution of any newspapers, magazines, journals, or other periodicals, or for services in connection therewith, not including, however, the preparation and printing of documents and reports authorized and required to be issued by law.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Page 34, line 24, after the word "law," insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"No part of the sums appropriated in this act shall be used for the preparation or dissemination of any propaganda, arguments, or statements in favor of or in opposition to the passage of proposed legislation, and no official or employee of the United States Shipping Board or the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation shall, during office hours, engage in such work, unless it be solely for the preparation of statements to be presented to a congressional committee or in response to requests from Members of Congress."

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Does the gentleman want to be heard upon the point of order?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I do not think it is necessary to be heard upon it. It is not a limitation. It is legislation upon an appropriation bill and is not warranted by any of the exceptions.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, at least the first portion of this paragraph is in accord with similar amendments that have been heretofore adopted, and it is clearly a limitation. I do not think there can be any question about that. Furthermore, if the Chair will look at the paragraph after which this amendment is offered he will notice that it is a limitation along the same line. The amendment is simply supplemental to the paragraph which it follows. The merchant marine act of 1920 specifically provides that the members of the Shipping Board shall devote all of their time to their official duties.

With regard to the latter part of the proposed amendment, it is likewise a limitation, because it undertakes to provide against employees of the Shipping Board who are receiving salaries from the Government devoting their time during office hours to unofficial matters instead of official matters, which will necessitate the employment of a larger number of employees than would be the case if they devoted all of their time to official matters. I think the general law provides or implies that all Government employees during office hours shall devote their time to the dispatch of official business, and the merchant marine act of 1920 expressly provides that members of the Shipping Board shall do that.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the Chair hear me on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, under the decision long ago made by Mr. Speaker CANNON, and which has been followed, a limitation can not contain legislation except in one case, and that is where it comes within the provision of the Holman rule in retrenching expenditures. This amendment—both paragraphs of the amendment—will retrench expenditures and clearly come within the provisions of the Holman rule. The first paragraph retrenches expenditures in that it provides that none of this money shall be wasted in propaganda. That is clearly a retrenchment in expenditures. It clearly brings it within the provisions of the Holman rule in that regard. The second paragraph retrenches expenditures, because it says that no employee of the Shipping Board shall waste his time on matters not connected with his duty under his employment. We have one man shown in the hearings who is paid \$9,500 a year merely to attend committees of the House and Senate. That is a useless service. There may be other men who do not put in the time the law requires, and if by this amendment they do put in the time, it would be a retrenchment of expenditures provided in this bill; and I submit, Mr. Chairman, in all fairness and in all sincerity that this amendment should not be ruled out on the point of order, because every part of it comes within the Holman rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The language of the amendment is that—

No part of the sums appropriated in this act shall be used for the preparation or dissemination of any propaganda, arguments, or statements in favor of or in opposition to the passage of proposed legislation; and no official or employee of the United States Shipping Board or United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation shall, during office hours, engage in such work unless it be solely for the preparation of statements to be presented to a congressional committee or in response to requests from Members of Congress.

Now, if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee had been limited to the first proposition, namely: "No part of the sums appropriated in this act shall be used for the preparation or dissemination of any propaganda, arguments, or statements in favor of or in opposition to the passage of proposed legislation," it would be clearly in order under the rule. But a limitation on an appropriation bill must be to the appropriation and not an affirmative limitation to an official function. Such affirmative limitations of official function are proposed in the second part of the amendment. A part being obnoxious to the rule, the whole amendment must be declared out of order by the Chair, and therefore the Chair sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 34, line 24, after the word "law," insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"No part of the sums appropriated in this act shall be used for the preparation or dissemination of any propaganda, arguments, or statements in favor of or in opposition to the passage of proposed legislation."

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Now, the last paragraph on page 34 in the bill provides that—

No part of the funds appropriated or made available in this act for the United States Shipping Board or the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation shall be expended for the preparation, printing, publication, or distribution of any newspapers, magazines, journals, or other periodicals, etc.

However, that does not go far enough. That does not include one of the most extensive and one of the most expensive features of work along that line. The Shipping Board has been accustomed to having prepared and distributed numerous statements and documents of various sorts for the purpose of influencing legislation and for other reasons. The foregoing paragraph recognizes the fact in principle that it is not proper to do these things for any purpose, and I respectfully submit that it is not the function of any bureau or any department of this Government, but it is contrary to the spirit of our institutions for any one of them to undertake to bring a "back fire" upon Members of Congress in order to force through legislation or promote legislation or to prevent legislation in which they are interested. And I say that it is high time for the American Congress in unmistakable terms to give notice to all executive branches of this Government and various bureaus that they are not going to stand for any such thing, and are not going to make appropriations for the purpose of creating a sentiment and a propaganda to be brought to bear upon them in an effort to try to make them do this, that, or the other. It is wrong in principle; it is a wrong custom, not only in regard to the Shipping Board, but, of course, it applies equally to any other bureau or commission. Now, I want to show you how far it has gone with the Shipping Board. I hold in my hand a document of 306 pages, a multigraphed document, and it is expensively bound.

It costs much more than to have it printed, and I have a written memorandum furnished by an employee of the Shipping Board who is in a position to be familiar with the facts and who is entirely reliable, and he makes the statement that this document, which is simply propaganda and arguments in favor of a certain measure, was prepared in the Shipping Board and by officials and employees of the Shipping Board, and he makes the statement that over 217,000 of these documents were made in the Shipping Board and made out of material paid for by the Government and prepared and made up and distributed by officials in the Shipping Board who were receiving Government salaries. This was distributed throughout the country, to newspapers, business organizations, and what not, and at what expense I do not know, but it is in regard to the preparation and distribution of this document that this same official says that "our duplicating section was working on this issue for several weeks, holding up important work; some duplicating work in connection with the regular routine was laid up over three weeks. Mr. Lasker's orders were to give this pamphlet precedence over everything else."

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman give us the page of the hearings from which he made that statement?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. It is not in the hearings. I stated this is a memorandum furnished me by an employee in the Shipping Board.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. A private letter?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Yes; a private memorandum. I am not speaking from personal knowledge as to the number, but the information comes from a trustworthy source. Now, I want to tell you what else. That is not all. The Shipping Board has a bureau of information—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Now, Mr. Chairman, in addition to this document to which I have referred, they have issued others of the same order. They have a Bureau of Information down there. Some of you will recall that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] made a speech in which he read from a statement issued by the Bureau of Information of the Shipping Board in regard to a social function. He made a humorous speech upon it. Now they are continually issuing documents like this, which has on it the inscription: "Bureau of Information. Caution: Advance release. United States Shipping Board, Washington, D. C. Release afternoon newspapers, October 24, 1922. No. 565." That would indicate that they have issued 565 statements from this Bureau of Information.

Now, this particular document that I hold in my hand is in no sense a vehicle for the dissemination of official information.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Has not the Shipping Board authority to issue reports when it deems it necessary in order to enlighten the people as to what they are accomplishing in the discharge of their official duties?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. The Shipping Board has no authority to issue such documents as this to which I am referring. This is in no sense official, as is shown on its face. It is carrying and sending to the press, upon Shipping Board stationery and by Shipping Board officials, a speech that was made down here at the City Club of Washington by Senator George E. Chamberlain, of Oregon, at a luncheon, in which he discussed the merchant marine.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Are not the people entitled to know what Mr. Chamberlain, who is a member of the board, thinks on the subject?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Yes; but the proper thing for the Members of this branch of the Government to do—the only decent thing for them to do—is, when they wish to express their views as to legislation, to appear before the legislative committee considering those matters and make their statements there, and when Members of Congress want to cross-examine them they can cross-examine them. But I say it is an improper function for them to send these things out all over the country, as they are doing, in order to try to bring pressure upon Members of Congress, and not try to convince Members of Congress by the arguments they can present at hearings.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that if we can get the benefit of the views of these men through the newspapers of the country it will be much more advantageous than trying to get them through belated reports or hearings before committees.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. If the gentleman has that idea of our form of government and the spirit of the Constitution, which creates three distinct branches of government and provides against the encroachment of one on the other, he has an idea radically different from mine. I think he is wrong. What would be the situation if every other bureau of the Government can at right devote all their time trying to get through legislation that will add them and help them to carry out their views, and make soft jobs for them, and confer upon them the authority to disburse Government money? I say it is no proper function, and I say that this amendment ought to be adopted. It has been adopted in regard to other departments on other bills.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. The gentleman knows that not one in a hundred thousand people read the reports of hearings before committees; and if these reports can be disseminated through the press the people will be better informed.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. But they have no right, at public expense, at the expense of the people, to spend that money in

distributing partisan views on one side or the other of any proposed legislation. That is my view about it.

Mr. EDMONDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. EDMONDS. I would like to state that I have just obtained from Mr. Lissner information that 1,000 copies of that document are all that were made by the Shipping Board, instead of 217,000 copies, as the gentleman stated.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I do not concede the correctness of that statement, because Mr. Lissner has made statements before the committee that I know are inaccurate. I have seen him perform before.

Mr. EDMONDS. Mr. Chairman, answering the gentleman from Tennessee, I will state that he made the statement on the floor here that 217,000 copies of this study of shipping conditions were published by the Shipping Board.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDS. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I said that I had a memorandum furnished by an employee of the Shipping Board in which he stated that that was the fact. He was in the section that issued it.

Mr. EDMONDS. Yes; and the gentleman puts that out without any attempt to confirm or verify it on his part. The multigraph copies were gotten up by the Shipping Board after I had seen the first copy of it and were sent to each Member of Congress. Those multigraph copies were gotten up for that special purpose, so that each Member of Congress could have a copy of it for study.

That took 500 copies right away, as the gentleman knows, to cover the membership of Congress. Now the gentleman comes in and makes a wild statement, that for three weeks the multigraph section of the Shipping Board were at work publishing a huge book like that, 217,000 copies, without going down to the board and getting confirmation of that statement.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDS. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Does the gentleman contend that that immense volume of more than 300 pages, whether a thousand copies or 217,000 copies were printed or not, should be printed out of Government money?

Mr. EDMONDS. I believe it is a good thing that each Member of Congress should have a copy of that study of the shipping situation.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to know if the gentleman believes that the money of the taxpayers should be used in that way to advocate partisan legislation?

Mr. EDMONDS. I do not believe it is advocating partisan legislation. It is a study prepared by men engaged in the shipping business, on shipping matters, and I believe it is proper that Members of Congress should be furnished with that information.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDS. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. The gentleman wants to know why I did not seek further information. The gentleman knows and the printed hearings will show that at the hearings I repeatedly asked, and other members of the committee asked, the Shipping Board to furnish an itemized statement of the disbursements of that \$1,715,000 advertising fund which they have this year, and that they have never furnished that information.

Mr. EDMONDS. The gentleman did not ask me for the information, and I am not responsible for what the Shipping Board did or did not give.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I tried to get the information and could not.

Mr. EDMONDS. You could very easily have confirmed the fact whether 217,000 of these copies were published, and would have found out that they were not published, without making the statement as a matter of information on the floor.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I do not believe I could have got any accurate information, and for my part I do not believe the statement Lissner made to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I would believe my informant any time before I would Lissner.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman, I have never held a brief for the Shipping Board. When I came to Congress I was told that there was bad management. I looked into their record to such an extent that I concluded there had been bad management, and I have voted against all previous appropriations for the Shipping Board. I think, however, that Members of Congress ought to be fair, and my attention was called to that this morning when my good friend from Texas [Mr. JONES] offered

his amendment to limit the number of attorneys that they should have the right to employ.

Mr. Lasker has made an effective showing in the administration of the affairs of the Shipping Board. He has reduced the overhead expense and reduced the drain on the Federal Treasury, and he is entitled to credit from the Congress for that. If it takes a large number of attorneys to attend to that work, he should not be hampered in doing it.

I have been unable to agree with Mr. Lasker on the question of ship subsidy. I must say, however, that I have been treated as a gentleman. I do not know where the Members are who have been punished because their views were adverse to those of Mr. Lasker. Certainly no man on this floor took any more positive stand against Mr. Lasker on the subject of the ship subsidy than I did, and I have not received any punishment, nor have I heard of anyone else who has. I am not going to complain of the fact that he tried to put the facts before me. I welcomed that publication. It was based on that publication that I became more sure of my ground in casting my vote against the ship subsidy; but I do not want to be a party to-day to reflecting upon a Government official who has made good. There was not a department of this Government that was worse managed under Democratic rule and in which there was a more unwarranted waste of the people's money than the Shipping Board; and if Mr. Lasker has come here, as I believe he has, at a sacrifice to himself, at a salary wholly inadequate as compared with his earning capacity, and has saved this Government millions of dollars in the management of that Shipping Board, I for one want to go on record as complimenting him for it and not as slurring him.

Another thing: I would not like the precedent of adopting this amendment. I believe that the people of this country have a right to know through the executive departments of the Government what is going on in the Government. I do not know of any money that is expended out of our appropriations that is used to better effect than that.

I would hate to have this Congress put that kind of a limitation in the Agricultural appropriation bill, and if it is good for one it would be good for another. I do not think the average Congressman need have any fear of being influenced by having the facts presented to him; and as long as they do present facts on it, we had better act upon those facts. If I vote wrong on the matter of the ship subsidy and there are facts in the possession of the Shipping Board to convince my constituency that I do, they are welcome to present those facts. I made up my mind how to cast my vote after a hard and arduous study of the very document that is being criticized here to-day. I do not think this amendment ought to be agreed to. [Applause.]

Mr. SEARS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SEARS. The gentleman is very able and very eloquent—

Mr. TINCHER. I yield for a question.

Mr. SEARS. Of course the gentleman acknowledges that?

Mr. TINCHER. I hope there is no question about that.

Mr. SEARS. We listen to the gentleman's speeches with a great deal of pleasure, but he pays to send them out to his constituents, does he not?

Mr. TINCHER. I have never sent out but one speech, and that was in answer to a statement which in its inaccuracy was comparable to the statement made here to-day that there were 217,000 of those documents printed at Government expense. To answer just such a statement as that emanating from that side of the aisle I once paid out \$30.41 for one speech.

Mr. SEARS. Of course, punishing the people to that amount for the sending out of a speech would be a sufficient punishment, but the gentleman paid for his own speech, and the point I am making is that we, as Members of Congress elected by great constituencies, pay for our own speeches. The question I wish to ask the gentleman is, Does he think each department of the Government ought to send out as Government literature under a frank the speech of any member of that department made at a dinner or luncheon?

Mr. TINCHER. I do not understand that there has been any abuse in sending out any speeches, and I think perhaps it would be just as fair to let the executive departments of the Government express their views to the people as it is to let Members of Congress do it. At least, I am not afraid of anything that they may send out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. STAFFORD. May we have it reported again?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Page 34, line 24, after the word "law," insert a new paragraph as follows:

"No part of the sums appropriated in this act shall be used for the preparation or dissemination of any propaganda, arguments, or statements in favor of or in opposition to the passage of proposed legislation."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee) there were—ayes 40, noes 64.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers another amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Page 34, line 21, after the word "periodicals," insert "or of any documents or statements"

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. So that it will read—

The Clerk read as follows:

No part of the funds appropriated or made available in this act for the United States Shipping Board or the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation shall be expended for the preparation, printing, publication, or distribution of any newspapers, magazines, journals, or other periodicals, or of any documents or statements, or for services in connection therewith, not including, however, the preparation and printing of documents and reports authorized and required to be issued by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question being taken, on a division there were—ayes 45, noes 59.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Texas: Page 34, line 5, after the word "ships," insert the following proviso: "Provided further, That in no event shall more than \$350,000 of the sum appropriated by this act be used to pay the compensation of attorneys, regular or special, for the United States Shipping Board or the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation."

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a legitimate amendment, and I offer it for the specific purpose of placing a limitation on the amount that can be expended, and I call attention to the excuses that were offered by the gentleman in charge of this bill for voting down the amendment I offered before, which was a similar limitation. He said that we offered a specific limitation as to the amount without showing that that was all that was needed. That is a remarkable statement. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, it is the duty of the chairman of the committee, who has the laboring oar, in offering an appropriation to show that it is necessary to have the amount that is appropriated. Now, if there are no showings in the hearings and no evidence offered on the floor to justify unlimited appropriation for attorneys, why should not there be a limitation of \$350,000, or even \$200,000? In other words, the chairman of the committee ought to furnish the information justifying any proposed appropriation.

When I said I could not find anything in the hearings to justify such an appropriation the gentleman chided me and upbraided me by stating that I had not read the hearings. I want to say that that is a poor way to furnish information. I asked him for the page, and he declined to give it; he declined to give the information. That is only another evidence of the mistake that was made when this House put all the power to make appropriations in the hands of one committee. You can not get any information from them.

Now, when several other Members of the House joined me in asking the gentleman what the attorneys were doing—in what kind of work they were engaged—the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood], referred to the hearings of last year to find out—the very hearings that he upbraided me for referring to. This action on his part thoroughly justified me in going to last year's hearings as the only source of any real information on this subject. I again repeat there is not a word in the hearings this year to show what these attorneys are doing. The only thing is on page 322, an exhibit showing the number of claims that are pending. This committee was so busy that it could not go into the details of finding out what the attorneys were doing.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I will.

Mr. BEGG. The gentleman is interested in having the Shipping Board conducted on economical lines?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I am.

Mr. BEGG. The gentleman is familiar with business organizations. Does he believe that the executive or head responsible for results can function better or worse with the number of curtailments and restrictions that are placed around it?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Well, if the position of the gentleman from Ohio is correct, why does not Congress say to these fellows: "Boys, there is the United States Treasury without any limit; go ahead and use any amount that your heart wishes?" That would be a great way to legislate.

Mr. BEGG. I will accept the gentleman's statement.

Mr. JONES of Texas. That is the logic of the gentleman's position. I say that this Congress ought to know the purpose for which it makes appropriations, and I am not in favor of taking off the lid and leaving it to the judgment of the men who have hired \$11,000 men at \$25,000 or \$35,000 a year.

Mr. BEGG. This Congress is in no way responsible for the head of that department; that is an executive function. The gentleman will grant that.

Mr. JONES of Texas. No; I will not grant it. The Congress is responsible for the appropriations made and the purposes for which they are used. Of course, they have to indulge the administrative part of it, but good legislation demands that Congress define the purposes to which any appropriation may be put.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. BLANTON. There is not one single word in the bill along the line of the limitation offered by the gentleman from Texas—not a word.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Most assuredly not, and they could, if they wished, spend a million dollars a year for these attorneys.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. It is quite remarkable how illogical gentlemen may be without seeming to realize it. We have been trying to put an end to the management and operation of a great fleet by the Government by passing a bill under which we hope to transfer these activities to private management and control, where it belongs. The gentleman from Texas who has just spoken, and most of the gentlemen on that side, are very much opposed to that action. They insist on keeping the Government in the shipping business; they insist that the Government shall continue to operate ships and settle claims and transact a great shipping business. And then they want to hog-tie the agents and agencies of the Government in their efforts to protect the public and the people. That is their position—as illogical as it is possible for one to take. The curious thing about it is that these gentlemen do not seem to appreciate how illogical their position is and how little appreciation of our responsibilities their position indicates.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak 10 minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent to speak 10 minutes out of order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I feel like the importance of the controversy that is now going on over the pending proposition with reference to the taxing of shares of stocks in national banks justifies an apparent repetition of some things and frequent reference to it. Unfortunately, I was absent a few days ago when the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLS] discussed the question, and I only heard the latter part of his statement. I discussed it some at that time. Mr. MILLS says the question has been raised by two decisions of the courts, one the decision of the Supreme Court in the Richmond, Va., case, and the other the decision of the Court of Appeals of New York in the Hanover Bank case. A reference to the remarks of the gentleman from New York disclosed that he has fallen into the error that a great many other men fall into, including a number of very able lawyers.

That error is that they contend that those two decisions constitute a new departure by the courts in their interpretation of the old, old statute that has been on the books for nearly 60 years. I want to reiterate, because that is back of the philosophy of the bill which the House passed, which was supported without regard to politics by the members of the Banking and Currency Committee who looked into the matter, the courts in all of the decisions that they have handed down, including the two decisions in question, that of the Richmond case and that of the Hanover case, have not varied one iota

in their interpretation and application of the statute. The question comes from discriminations in the New York tax laws and in the tax laws of a few other States. To show you that there is no change in the Richmond case, I will read the quotation which the gentleman from New York himself put into the record, reading from the decision of the New York court. I read:

By repeated decisions of this court, dealing with the restrictions here imposed, it has become established that while the words "moneyed capital in the hands of individual citizens" do not include shares of stock in corporations that do not enter into competition with the national banks, they do include something besides shares in banking corporations and others that enter into direct competition with those banks. They include not only moneys invested in private banking, properly so called, but investments of individuals in securities that represent money at interest and other evidences of indebtedness.

The gentleman stopped there in his interpretation, but the court went on—

such as normally enter into the business of banking.

In the opening statement of that decision the court says "by repeated decisions of this court." It is bottoming its decision in the case at bar upon a long line of decisions of the courts which it approves.

The gentleman from New York, on page 1540 of the RECORD of January 10, 1923, from which I just read that quotation, says:

"* * * I think it is utterly absurd, and worse than absurd, that such great and prosperous institutions as the First National Bank of the city of New York and the City National Bank of the city of New York should not be paying to-day a fair tax to the city of New York or the State of New York—

I agree with him in that. I think it is absurd and ridiculous, but he goes on and he gives a different reason—

because some smart people have come down here and have been smart enough to bamboozle Congress by saying that the State of New York has not sufficiently taxed private bankers and, therefore, Congress ought not to let them tax national banks. The situation in New York, I do not mind saying, in my judgment, is nothing short of scandalous.

I agree with him. It is scandalous; but the blame is not upon Congress. The suggestion that Congress has been bamboozled is unfounded. If anybody has been bamboozled, it is the legislature and the courts of his own State. By unanimous decision the court of his own State condemned the discriminatory and scandalous tax laws of the State of New York. The court of his own State unanimously condemned that absurdity and specifically referred to Kuhn, Loeb & Co. and J. P. Morgan & Co. I have no interest in any controversy between the City National Bank and Morgan & Co., and I think all will agree that in a controversy of that kind I can be scrupulously fair, and I think my judgment may be more unbiased on the question than the judgment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLS].

The contention I make is that the gentleman is wrong in blaming Congress. The absurdity, the unfairness, exists in the New York statutes. He says it is absurd because the City National Bank shall escape. Yes; it is. They are permitted to escape because the tax laws of the State of New York were deliberately drawn so that a heavier burden was placed upon the State incorporated banks and the national incorporated banks, including the City National Bank, than is placed on private bankers like Kuhn, Loeb & Co. and J. P. Morgan & Co.

I say and I repeat what I said the other day. Let these gentlemen go to Albany, go to Madison, and to the other capitals, to their own State legislatures, and say to those legislatures, Amend your tax laws so that the burden of taxation on moneyed capital shall fall equally and uniformly, and non-discriminately on every group of individuals, whether they be incorporated or private bankers. If they will do that, they will run counter neither to the statute that Congress has enacted nor to the decisions—the long line of decisions—of the Supreme Court of the United States and the courts of the different States. I am very glad to see that they are beginning to awaken in the State of New York to the fact that the real effort to bamboozle is on the other side. They are trying to prevent the legislature in New York from correcting this. The shrewdest legislative agent that any group ever had is busy in New York trying to make it appear that the blame is on Congress, and I notice in this morning's New York World an editorial that shows that they are beginning to realize that the blame is not on Congress, but that the proper place to go is to Albany.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINGO. Yes.

Mr. HUSTED. If the Legislature of the State of New York had followed the provisions of the Federal statute, there would not have been any trouble.

Mr. WINGO. Certainly not; absolutely none. In other words, the Federal statutes grew out of the escape of banks

from taxation a long time ago under the very plan they advocate. So Congress came along and put a nondiscriminatory limit on that and simply said this much, You can tax national banks that are instrumentalities of the Federal Government, and the Federal Government will not shield them, but when you do it you must not discriminate, you must not put a higher tax burden on those national banks than you do on J. P. Morgan & Co. I want now to read the editorial to which I referred, which tersely states the situation:

CONGRESS AND THE BANK-TAX MUDDLE.

We do not know why Representative OGDEN MILLS and other complainants should be taking the bank-tax troubles of this State to Washington. The place for them to go to is Albany.

Congress can not well do better than it has done under a law passed nearly 60 years ago. This law permits the States to tax national-bank shares as personal property to the owner, but the rate of tax must not be higher than on other banking capital. So this State for years has had a tax of 1 per cent on the book value of shares in all banks, national or State, and it has continued this tax after all other intangible personal property has been exempted from the old tax.

Then came the State income tax to make good the loss of revenue from prohibition of the excise taxes into profits for bootleggers, and this is the cause of the whole mischief. The 1 per cent tax on bank shares was continued, and income from the shares was taxed additionally. But private or unincorporated banks are taxed on income alone, and not over 3 per cent, which is, of course, a very much lower tax than 1 per cent on the capitalized value of income. This is a clear discrimination in favor of some moneyed or banking capital against that of the national banks in New York State. Those banks object, and why should they not? And they have won in the recent decision of the Court of Appeals.

What would Mr. MILLS and the others have Congress do? Validate the discrimination? Congress should not and never will do it, and if it did the Supreme Court would have something to say. The thing to do is to end the discrimination, and that is a job for Albany, not Washington. Congress can pertinently be appealed to on this score for such a liberalization of the Volstead law as will restore to this and other States similarly situated some part at least of their old excise revenues. But how otherwise?

How can they reach it, they ask? They say it is impossible to tax intangible property at a high rate. I grant you that experience has shown that you have to do the unfair thing, morally, but the wise thing from the standpoint of expediency, namely, fix a lower intangible tax rate in order to get the revenue. But because the problem is difficult does not mean it can not be solved by proper State tax laws. The present tax laws of New York and some other States, and the proposal of the gentleman from New York and those who oppose the House bill, exempt from taxation an enormous amount of capital. Let the State of New York and its cities go to Albany for relief from this tax-exemption scandal instead of urging Congress to approve her law, which her court condemns and by which the exemption exists at the expense of national banks and the other taxpayers who are not favored and exempted, as are her private bankers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

No officer or employee of the United States Shipping Board or the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation shall be paid a salary or compensation at a rate per annum in excess of \$11,000 except the following: Six at not to exceed \$25,000 each and two at not to exceed \$20,000 each.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITE of Kansas: Page 35, line 11, strike out the figures "\$25,000" and insert "\$12,000," and in line 12 strike out "\$20,000" and insert "\$11,000" in lieu thereof.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, any argument I might present in support of this amendment would be a résumé of my statement a few minutes ago in discussing the Jones amendment, for my remarks, gentlemen of the committee at that time will remember, were directed to this subject. Now, Mr. Chairman, I only want to say this in addition to what I said, that I have never believed, do not now, that there was ever any excuse or justification or added efficiency in the administration of this bureau because we paid those extravagant salaries. Gentlemen will note that here on the seats are the able lawyers of this House and of this country, and back at home are the mates to those men. They might have been as good as their successful competitors, and I have observed, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of this committee, that there are groups and squads and regiments and armies of men ready to sacrifice themselves in the public service, and I have wondered why it might not apply just as appropriately to the gentlemen who are prosecuting the cases for this Government under the direction of the Shipping Board as well as in other lines of the public service.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. I will.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Does the gentleman know that, as a matter of fact, these salaries do not relate to lawyers but relate to the operating department of the Shipping Board, shipping men?

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. They are designated as attorneys.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Not these men; these are not attorneys.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Then why do they have so much money?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. These are expert shipping men who would get two or three times as much salary on the outside.

Mr. STAFFORD. They do not have this kind out in Kansas.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. How many reductions have been made from this year's salaries?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. They provide for six and we have four.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. How many have offered to resign and—

Mr. STAFFORD. Nobody ever offers to resign when attached to the Government pay roll.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. I have heard it so stated and I admit I am inclined to agree. I believe that there are many self-sacrificing men who for a salary of \$12,000 would contribute a few thousand dollars worth of sacrifice in addition thereto to the \$12,000 to serve their country. It has always been so. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. My recollection is that these figures were reduced from \$35,000 a couple of years ago to \$25,000, and I will say to the gentleman that these men constitute the operating staff of the Shipping Board, who are working with the chairman for the purpose of establishing this business, and I know that they are not any more anxious than the chairman of the Shipping Board is to stay, but they have undertaken the work of attempting to establish and reorganize the Shipping Board business, and they will continue trying to do so for a while longer. I simply rose to make certain that my friend understood that these salaries are not for lawyers.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Well, I am pleased to have the information. Now, I want to say to the gentleman and to the members of this committee that proceeding under the Constitution for more than 133 years we have not paid to the heads of the departments, we have not paid to Members of Congress, to United States Senators, to the representatives of this Government in foreign countries, its ambassadors, with a few possible exceptions, such salaries. The example is corrupting, it is a dangerous proceeding, and it is not justifiable.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. I would like to proceed for a minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. I fear this amendment will not carry. I recognize the soporific influence of the chairman over the committee. I want to say to you gentlemen that the amendment is right and ought to prevail, and it is in line with our previous ideas of economy and the people will approve it.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, of course when those on the Republican side cry for a vote when we are trying to effect economy we should heed their call, because I have found during the past eight years the man who makes a fight for economy is simply wearing out his life. We talk economy on the stump. We talk that when we are trying to get votes, but when we vote here the past is too oft forgotten. Now, my good friend from Illinois says these are executive officers, and therefore they must get \$25,000 a year. If I am correctly informed, Mr. Lasker only gets \$12,000 a year, and therefore he is bossing the man who is getting \$25,000 a year, and saying to the man who is getting \$25,000 a year not to work to-day or to work to-morrow.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEARS. I will.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. That happens to be correct. Mr. Lasker holds what is considered a somewhat political office, like the gentleman and myself, being appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. But these men are business men taken from shipping work and the shipping industry. That is the difference.

Mr. SEARS. The only difference is that Mr. Lasker holds an office somewhat similar to ours.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. And I think there is some honor in our position.

Mr. SEARS. He is confirmed by the Senate, and the man who gets \$25,000 a year is appointed by Mr. Lasker, who was never elected by anybody, and confirmed by the seven commissioners—that is the only difference—while we must be elected by the people.

Now, I think it is unfair for the gentlemen on the Republican side to make it appear that we are fighting the Shipping Board

or to make it appear that we are trying to fight Mr. Lasker. I made the same fight against the other members of the board.

Mr. WASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEARS. Yes.

Mr. WASON. Does the gentleman think that this side of the House is trying to make it appear that you are fighting the Shipping Board?

Mr. SEARS. The leader stated that our position was illogical, because we were trying to save some money for the people. If you will simply turn your minds back a few months, when the votes were counted, you will find that the American people are waking up to the fact that those who are making the fight for economy are not so illogical as you would make it appear.

I notice that my good friend from Indiana [Mr. Wood] will place in the Record the names of the attorneys. I would like for the gentleman from Indiana also to place in the Record the State and city and former employment of each of these, in order that we may find out what they did before they took over this wonderful work that they are doing for the people. We are not fighting the Shipping Board as individuals. I will again state we are only fighting for economy.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. What are you doing?

Mr. SEARS. What are we doing? We are doing what the gentleman from Indiana once did. We are doing what the Republican Party once did. It is true that we may be in the minority now, but we made the same fight when we were in the majority that we are now making, although we are now in the minority. My good friend from New Hampshire [Mr. Wason] asked why I should make the statement that I just made. I can answer that by saying that my good friend from Kansas [Mr. White], though we differ politically, says he knows his motion will not carry. Simply watch the votes when they stand up, and you will see why I make the statement. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate now close on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana moves that the debate now close on this amendment. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. White].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the "noes" appeared to have it.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. I ask for a division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 26, noes 39.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLACK: Page 25, line 11, at the beginning of the line, strike out "six" and insert in lieu thereof "four."

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, the committee having just voted down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. White], I think the House should be willing to accept the one I have offered, in view of the fact that the chairman of the board in his hearing on this bill stated that there were only four men employed at \$25,000 each. On page 290 of the hearings the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood] asked Mr. Lasker this question:

How many men have you now employed receiving \$25,000 or in excess of \$25,000?

Mr. Lasker said:

We have four men at \$25,000 and three men at \$20,000.

Now, in offering this amendment I do not wish to be understood as affirming that there ought to be as many as four employed at \$25,000 each, but I do say that at a time when it is admitted that the Emergency Fleet Corporation is operating at a monthly deficit that runs into millions of dollars it would be bad policy for Congress to authorize six men at \$25,000 each when only four are now being paid that salary.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for a suggestion?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. If the gentleman's amendment is agreed to they will have to discharge one of the men at \$20,000. One of the men authorized to receive not more than \$25,000 is em-

ployed now at \$20,000, which shows that they are trying to comply with the spirit of the law.

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. You are compelling them to discharge that man at \$20,000.

Mr. BLACK. I have observed the limitations that are in the bill.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. But they have three men at \$20,000 now.

Mr. BLACK. They have one too many, according to their own admission.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. No. That is one of the men authorized at not to exceed \$25,000.

Mr. BLACK. If the gentleman will permit, the bill now contains this language: "Two, not to exceed \$20,000." I have not disturbed that.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. All right.

Mr. BLACK. "Six at not to exceed \$25,000."

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Each one of those will stay at \$25,000. They are entitled to six of them.

Mr. BLACK. I do not admit that they are entitled to six. The position I take is that we should provide for four, the chairman of the board having said that only four men are now employed at \$25,000 each. If the gentleman wants to accomplish the thing he is now contending for, let him offer an amendment increasing two at \$20,000 to three at \$20,000, instead of trying to come in here and authorize six at \$25,000, when the chairman of the board himself says that only four are employed at that rate at present.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. The language reads "six at not to exceed \$25,000." I suppose they could make that \$5,000 if they pleased.

Mr. BLACK. The gentleman is intelligent enough to know that, and the gentleman also is intelligent enough to know that the purpose of this language is to permit the employment of six men at \$25,000.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to add to my amendment, so as to strike out "two" on line 11 and insert "three."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment in the manner indicated. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLACK: Page 25, line 11, at the beginning of the line, strike out "six" and insert "four," and in the same line strike out "two" and insert "three."

Mr. BLACK. If my amendment is adopted it will restrict the Shipping Board to the employment of four men at \$25,000 instead of six as the bill would now permit. It seems to me that even faint regard for economy should compel its adoption.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, this amendment should not be adopted. I do not know why the gentlemen on the other side, who can find no fault with the administration of the Shipping Board during the last 12 months, want to be throwing monkey wrenches into the machinery. I do not see why they should try to cripple this establishment. They ought to be trying to hold up the hands and encourage the man who has done more for it in the 12 months he has been there than was done during its entire previous existence under the old régime.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLACK. Is it not a fact that the hearings themselves disclose that only four men are employed at \$25,000?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. They do, and it is a compliment to the man who is at the head of this thing. He might have had six men there instead of four at \$25,000 each, but in order to save money to the Treasury of the United States and because he felt that the conditions warranted it he has reduced the number to four. He has also reduced many others. You might make your amendment go further. An emergency might arise during the winding up of this thing when it might be necessary to employ for a brief period a \$25,000-a-year man. Now, let me tell you something—

Mr. J. M. NELSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I do not yield. Mr. Lasker has four men working in his private business to-day to whom he pays more than \$100,000 a year. The United States Government is engaged in a private business, having to compete with the greatest business in the world, with the captains of industry of the world at the head of these great shipping industries. Now, as long as we are going to continue in private business, we must provide men of at least ordinary ability to compete with those captains of industry who are operating these independent concerns. It seems that it is hard for us to differen-

tiate. I am opposed to the Government engaging in any kind of private business, but we are in it, and as long as we are in it we ought to try to conform ourselves as nearly as possible to the policies and practices of men engaged in private business. Let us get out of it, and let us encourage the man who is doing something to try to get us out of it, rather than try to discourage him. I think the conduct of this Shipping Board during the last 12 months is the best possible recommendation of its efficiency, for never in the experience of the gentleman from Texas or myself has there ever been an activity approaching this in importance or volume. You have never found a single activity that has done more or half as much within its possibilities in saving money to the Treasury of the United States. Why handicap this man? If there had been something here to show that he had been abusing the privileges that we gave him a year ago there might be some reason for the handicap that you are trying to put upon him; but when you find that he has been conserving the interests of the Treasury and has not been using the privileges we gave him, let us at least give him the opportunity to do what may be necessary, so that in the event that something transpires in the winding up of this thing—I hope it will all be wound up within a year—they may have, if the opportunity requires, a \$25,000 man to compete across the table in making contracts to sell this property. It is going to be a pretty important thing. Suppose the ship subsidy bill passes? It can not all be wound up in a day. It may pass, to the chagrin and disappointment of gentlemen upon the other side who would like to see the flag of the United States disappear from the seas of the earth. In the event that it does pass, there must be dickerings and business transactions so that the United States may protect herself. Then it will need the best ability, the best experience, representing the best interests of the United States and the people of the United States to see that we are protected, and possibly it will take \$25,000-a-year men. I am speaking only of a possibility. It may never occur.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have one minute more. I wish to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Indiana be extended one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. The gentleman said two or three times that it was necessary to continue this, pending the winding up of this business. Has the committee made any inquiry as to when that will probably occur?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. That will depend upon the action of the body at the other end of the Capitol and the action of this body on this side. If those who are desirous of maintaining the best traditions of the United States and its future welfare in establishing a merchant marine are successful, then it will be done within less than six months. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

No part of the sum appropriated in this act shall be used to pay any claims of the United States Navy Department against the United States Shipping Board or the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation arising prior to July 1, 1921, or to pay any final judgment rendered in any suit authorized by the act entitled "An act authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty, suits for salvage services, and providing for the release of merchant vessels belonging to the United States from arrest and attachment in foreign jurisdictions, and for other purposes," approved March 9, 1920.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I move to strike out the last word. I should like to ask the chairman if there is any provision in this bill for the payment of the Norwegian claims recently arbitrated?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. That is not carried in this bill at all. There was a deficiency appropriation carrying that.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. In what bill is it carried?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It is carried in a deficiency bill, as I remember.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It is a State Department matter.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I thought it was a claim against the Shipping Board, and that it would have to be carried in this bill.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No; it was an independent claim growing out of a treaty, or the settlement was made pursuant to a treaty entered into by the State Department, for the settlement of these Norwegian claims, and the appropriation has already been made, as I remember, to carry it out.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. It has already been made, has it?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES VETERANS' BUREAU.

For carrying out the provisions of an act entitled "An act to establish a Veterans' Bureau and to improve the facilities and service of such bureau and to further amend and modify the war risk insurance act approved August 9, 1921," including salaries and expenses of the central office at Washington, D. C., and regional offices and suboffices, and including salaries, stationery and minor office supplies, furniture, equipment and supplies, rentals and alterations, heat, light, and water, miscellaneous expenses, including telephones, telegrams, freight, express, law books, books of reference, periodicals, ambulance service, towel service, laundry service, repairs to equipment, storage, ice, taxi service, car fare, stamps and box rent, travelling and subsistence, salaries and expenses of employees engaged in field investigation, passenger-carrying and other motor vehicles, including purchase, maintenance, repairs, and operation of same, vehicles at a total cost of not exceeding \$7,500 may be salaries and operating expenses of the Arlington Building and annex, including repairs and mechanical equipment, fuel, electric current, ice, ash removal, and miscellaneous items; and including the salaries and allowances, where applicable, wages, travel, and subsistence of civil employees at the United States veterans' hospitals, supply depots, dispensaries, clinics, and vocational schools, \$49,984,063: *Provided*, That on or before the 15th day of each month when Congress is in session, the Director of the Veterans' Bureau shall transmit to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives a statement giving in detail (a) the total number of positions at a rate of \$2,000 or more per annum, (b) the rate of salary attached to each position, (c) the number of positions at each rate in the central office and in each district office or suboffice, and (d) a brief statement of the duties of each position.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOOD of Indiana: On page 37, line 13, strike out the words "vehicles at," and in line 14, strike out the words "a total cost of not exceeding \$7,500 may be."

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. This provision was carried under the necessities of last year's bill and crept into this bill. There is no necessity for it now.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I ask the indulgence of the committee for about 10 minutes, or perhaps more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. I am sure every Member of the House is anxious to know something about the hospitalization situation throughout the country. During the time allotted to me I will endeavor to give you such information as I can on that subject. Since 1919 the Congress has appropriated approximately \$54,000,000 for the construction of hospitals and the provision of additional facilities for the care of wounded and disabled veterans of the late war. In 1921, \$18,600,000 of that \$54,000,000 was appropriated to the Treasury Department, and the allotment of the appropriation was made upon the advice of a medical consultant board, who recommended the places and kinds of buildings to be erected. Later \$17,000,000 was appropriated in a special act and placed at the disposal of the Director of the Veterans' Bureau. I have been very much concerned to know from time to time how the work of building was progressing. During the hearings on this bill I interrogated Colonel Forbes, the director of the bureau, in respect to the progress that is being made under the two acts I have just described. It seems that even under the appropriation of \$18,600,000 some of the buildings authorized have not been completed. Under the appropriation of \$17,000,000 none of the buildings have been begun. The appropriation under the last act of \$17,000,000 was made the 20th of April last. That makes nine months from that date until now. When Colonel Forbes was before the Committee on Appropriations requesting the appropriation he promised our committee that he would have all the buildings under the authority granted by the act finished in nine months from the time the bids were advertised. Nine months have elapsed and two of the buildings have been let. He promised then that the cost of a bed would be about \$3,000. It is clear to those who know the facts that the cost will be very much higher than \$3,000 a bed; in fact, it will run from \$4,000 to a little over \$5,000.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman will let me make my statement first—I want to make a connected statement—I will then yield to him. I presume when the auxiliary buildings, such as the bakeries, the quarters for the officers and nurses, and other buildings are finished, that the cost will run up to \$5,000 a bed. In answer to a question I asked as to when we could hope for

the buildings to be placed at the disposal of the men for whom they were constructed, Colonel Forbes said it would be 300 days after the contract is let. Some have not been let, and I do not know when they will be. But the first one completed will not be completed in less than 300 days. We have, however, no serious embarrassment, because there are sufficient facilities to take care of the men even to-day.

I have had prepared by the Veterans' Bureau a statement showing the number of hospital beds, the number of patients, and the kind of patients, and I find the number of patients in the Government hospitals is 17,361, the number of patients in contract hospitals 7,075, the number in all the hospitals 24,936. The present number of Government beds in Government-owned hospitals is 24,759, coming within about 200 beds owned by the Government less than the number of patients in all the hospitals. The estimated number of Government beds remaining available February, 1924, is 20,503; new beds under the first and second Langley bills, when completed, 10,047; the total Government beds available February, 1924, 30,550, or 6,000 and something more than the total number of patients in the Government-owned and contract hospitals.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is that exclusive of the authorizations made for the Veterans' Bureau hospital?

Mr. MADDEN. That is exclusive.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman said that Colonel Forbes said he would have the hospital erected in nine months. Did he state what was the cause of the delay?

Mr. MADDEN. He is making as rapid progress as he can in making the plans and selecting the sites, and he said no contractor will take a contract to put up a building under present labor conditions in less than 300 days after he takes the contract.

Mr. MACLAFFERTY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. MACLAFFERTY. I want to say to the gentleman that at one of the hospitals at Livermore, Calif., the bids were opened two or three weeks ago and all were found to be beyond the estimate, and for that reason new bids had to be called for.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. Does the gentleman's table that he has show the number of tubercular cases and psychiatric cases?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; I will put them all in. Now, I have the data of the new building for psychiatrics at Little Rock, Ark., with 270 beds. I will not go into that now, but it will be completed soon for the patients provided for under the first and second Langley bill.

There is an interesting situation in respect to vocational training. I think more than 400,000 men made application since the war and 229,000 have been passed as eligible for admission. The law limits the applications to December 16, 1922. All applications after that time fail. The number in training on January 1, 1923, was 97,035. The estimated number in training January, 1924, will be 82,000. The estimated number on January, 1925, will be 42,000. So it shows a very marked decrease. The average cost per trainee for tuition and supplies is \$19.62, with allowance pay \$108.70. That is, the total cost per pupil is \$128.32 for vocational training per month. We have in this bill a limitation of \$5,781,000 attached to the appropriation for hospitalization. This limitation restricts to that sum the amount to be used for the construction of officers and nurses' quarters, and so forth, in connection with hospitals under way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. We provide that of the appropriation of \$48,683,000 for hospital care \$5,780,000 shall not be used for the purchase of any ground, the construction of any new hospital building, or for the purchase of any building and ground for hospital purposes. The reason why we put this limitation upon the use of this money is that in his examination Colonel Forbes informed the Committee on Appropriations that he had the authority under the law to use any money appropriated for any purpose for the benefit of the Veterans' Bureau, whether it be for salaries or rent or what not, for the purchase of property, the establishment of new hospitals; and we thought the time had come when we should get the opinion of the Comptroller General of the United States as to whether or not any

man in any department of the Government has the right to spend money appropriated for one purpose for another purpose. I asked Colonel Forbes if he thought he had the power to spend money appropriated for clerks for the purchase of hospital buildings, and he said he had. I asked him if he believed if we appropriated money for 20,000 clerks, and he used only 10,000 clerks, that he could use the balance of that money to buy buildings with, and he said he thought he could. I said, "If you can do that, then why do we appropriate at all; and if you have that power and I have the power to curtail it, I am going to do it"; and here we are with a limitation providing that the money appropriated for certain purposes in this bill can be used only for the purposes for which it is appropriated. There may be some opposition to that limitation, because I understand there are many requests made of Colonel Forbes to buy property not desirable, and there might be some influence brought to bear to permit this fund to be left free, without strings. I hope the House will agree with the Committee on Appropriations that there ought not to be any unlimited right to use funds appropriated for one purpose for any other purpose. It is bad business; it encourages extravagance; it encourages waste; and it may encourage corruption, we do not know; but if we think that we can avoid the suspicion of extravagance, the smell that goes up from corruption, by any limitation that we can place upon any expenditure in any appropriation bill, we would be criminally negligent if we did not do it; and I appeal to the House to sustain the Committee on Appropriations in the limitation which we have placed in this bill. The \$5,781,000 is for a legitimate need—that is, for hospital extensions; but there are other items in this provision, and we have placed the limitation on the \$5,781,000 because we do not want any more used than that which is set out. I have here a list of the purposes for which the \$5,781,000 is to be used. It is for ordinary repairs and hospitals, for approach work, for new construction work which is necessary to build quarters for the doctors and nurses and attendants; and we have set out here the exact purposes for which the money can be used and the amount that can be used for each item in detail.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the matter which the gentleman has before him, he says that the \$5,781,000 is necessary to make available hospital construction already undertaken and in part completed, but which can not be utilized to its full capacity because these details, kitchens, quarters, are not provided for the personnel.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes. If the House would not mind, this is not voluminous; it might be well to incorporate it in my remarks, so that we can have the information in detail as to just what this money can be used for. It will be illuminating, and not only illuminating but it will be an evidence of our desire to say to the director and to anyone else who may be interested that this is the purpose for which we appropriate the money, and that we have put it in the RECORD with that end in view.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Can the gentleman tell the committee whether it is contemplated by the Veterans' Bureau to extend the capacity of existing hospitals?

Mr. MADDEN. It is to extend the capacity to the extent of making quarters for the nurses and doctors and all that and giving the bed space now used to the patients.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Does not the gentleman think it would be good business to extend the bed capacity of the hospitals?

Mr. MADDEN. We are doing that. For example, let me show one case. Here is a case at Palo Alto, Calif. Two hundred and eighty-six thousand dollars are appropriated there. Ordinary repairs, \$25,000; approach work, \$8,000; and then employees' quarters, 70 beds. That is the extension.

Mr. KINCHELOE. The reason I asked the gentleman is this: At Dawsonsprings hospital—

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, there is something in here for that.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I think it is one of the most magnificent institutions I have ever seen. It has a bed capacity of 500. It seems to me that it would be wise to double the bed capacity.

Mr. MADDEN. There is an item of \$213,000 in this \$5,781,000 for Dawsonsprings.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I am talking about it as a matter of business judgment. The hospital is there, and I say one of the most magnificent I have ever seen. If they took some of the money and doubled the bed capacity, it would be better, I think, because all you have to do, with your overhead taken care of, is to build your bed units and then connect up the lighting and plumbing facilities.

Mr. STAFFORD. They have the capacity at Dawsonsprings, but the World War veterans will not go there.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Oh, the gentleman does not know what he is talking about. There are about 400 soldiers there now.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman does know what he is talking about.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I have recently come from there. That is characteristic of the information that used to be given when you were trying to defeat the bill, and especially by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. I have thought the information contained in these documents of sufficient importance to submit the case to the House, so that everybody may be able to answer any question that may be asked. We have taken care of the Dawsonsprings hospital.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Oh, I have no personal interest in the matter at all, except as a matter of economy, and of getting more beds.

Mr. MADDEN. I realize that; that is what this does.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Did not the last appropriation bill place at the discretion of the Director of the Veterans' Bureau \$17,000,000 for building purposes?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Now, is there anything in the law that leaves with the Congress any direct responsibility for a failure to construct those buildings up to date?

Mr. MADDEN. No, sir. I think we have done everything in our power to do what should be done and get early action and have the facilities completed.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. The delay is entirely chargeable to the departmental branch of the service in so far as there is any?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. BRIGGS. I want to ask the chairman of the committee if it is not a fact that under the hospital branch of the Veterans' Bureau better facilities are assigned to tuberculous patients than other kinds of patients—

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. And in some cases there is a shortage of hospital facilities for that kind of patients, and that shortage exists now and ought to be corrected at the earliest possible moment?

Mr. MADDEN. And every effort is being made to correct it.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Is it permissible to make additions to leased hospitals under the language of the bill?

Mr. MADDEN. No.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. The gentleman is certain about that?

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. LAZARO. I want to ask the gentleman a question for information. Do you have enough beds and suitable places for your mental and tuberculosis cases?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; when this program is completed; yes, indeed.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The bill which was passed granting the Director of the Veterans' Bureau authority to engage in furnishing and constructing buildings to the total amount of \$17,000,000 only authorized the making of contracts for that amount. Is there any law existing to-day where he may use that appropriation?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; we appropriated \$12,000,000 and authorized \$5,000,000, but that is not wanted for a year because he can not use it for 300 days.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. That is in the current appropriation bill?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. So, up to July 1 he will have available \$12,000,000 in money and an authorization for another \$5,000,000?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; but he will not need it because we are not up to that point.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. FESS. I desire to ask whether any information was given to the committee as to when we should reach the peak in the need for hospitalization?

Mr. MADDEN. We have reached the peak now. We have 24,000 men in the hospitals to-day. There were over 31,000, and we think it is because of the fact we are using dispensaries for the treatment of men who are employed outside and living at home which has taken the burden away from the hospitals which heretofore existed. And the further development of the dispensary system will continue to relieve the Government from the need of having beds in hospitals to a large extent.

Mr. FESS. So the facilities already authorized will be sufficient?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, yes; we will have 10,000 beds to spare when we get it completed.

Mr. FESS. The Surgeon General made a statement to a committee about two years ago that it would be 1926 before we reached the peak.

Mr. MADDEN. We have reached it now because we have dropped from 31,000 to 24,000.

Mr. FESS. There is another question I am very much interested in, and that is we will reach the maximum vocation work very soon.

Mr. MADDEN. We have reached it. According to our estimate we have 97,000 now, and we expect a year from now to have only 82,000, and a year from that time only 42,000, so we have reached the maximum now.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman give the number of sick soldiers taken care of in Government hospitals and the number taken care of in contract hospitals? Will the gentleman tell us what kind of treatment they receive in contract hospitals and if they are asking the Government to take care of all of them?

Mr. MADDEN. The committee can not tell, but the information we have is that they are getting as good treatment in the contract hospitals as they are getting anywhere else, but we have no information; that is, direct information, and we have to take our information secondhand.

Mr. LAZARO. Is there any effort being made to have all of them taken care of in Government hospitals?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; just as fast as we get the buildings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have one additional minute. I desire to ask a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the question: The gentleman said in his judgment we had reached the peak and that soon he thought we would have 10,000 beds to spare; that would be the surplus?

Mr. MADDEN. That is, to spare, if we continue to have these contract hospitals.

Mr. BLANTON. Why not use the same contract hospitals if we have reached the peak, if we can care for them properly, and then we will not have them on our hands in a few years?

Mr. MADDEN. In the first place, the men were very hesitant about going into contract hospitals. That induced Congress to establish a policy of building Government-owned hospitals. These Government-owned hospitals have been appropriated for and the policy has been established by the Congress, the work is under way in accordance with that policy established, and the appropriations made, and we are powerless to change that.

Mr. BLANTON. But I can cite the gentleman to numerous service men and women in the contract hospital at San Angelo, Tex., and El Paso, Tex., both in the district of my colleague, Mr. HUDSPETH, out of my district, and in New Mexico, where splendid service is given in contract hospitals.

Mr. MADDEN. I think the contract hospitals are just as good, but there was a great deal of prejudice about them for a long time, and so Congress was induced to establish a different policy.

Mr. LAZARO. What is the difference in the cost of the treatment?

Mr. MADDEN. There is not much difference.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert the statements in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to insert the statements referred to in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following are the statements referred to:

Hospital facilities, U. S. Veterans' Bureau.

	Tuberculosis.	Neuropsychiatric.	General.	Total.
Number of patients, Government hospitals	7,812	5,014	4,535	17,361
Number of patients, contract hospitals	2,596	3,965	1,044	7,575
Number of patients, all hospitals	10,378	8,979	5,579	24,936
Present Government beds available	10,785	6,027	7,947	24,759
Estimated Government beds remaining available February, 1924, exclusive of first and second Langley bill hospitals	8,935	4,386	7,182	20,503
New beds under first and second Langley bills	4,227	5,370	450	10,047
Total Government beds available February, 1924	13,162	9,756	7,632	30,550

Date of completion of hospitals constructed under first and second Langley bills or additions to existing hospitals.

FIRST LANGLEY BILL.

Hospital.	Type.	Beds.	Date of opening or estimated date of completion.
North Little Rock, Ark.	Neuropsychiatric	270	Dec. 1, 1921. ¹
Bronx, New York	do.	1,011	Apr. 17, 1922. ¹
Walla Walla, Wash.	Tuberculosis	165	May 10, 1922.
Fort McKenzie, Wyo.	Neuropsychiatric	245	May 12, 1922.
Lake City, Fla.	Tuberculosis	100	Aug. 25, 1922.
Perryville, Md.	Neuropsychiatric	300	July 11, 1922.
Fort Bayard, N. Mex.	Tuberculosis	250	Do.
Prescott, Ariz.	do.	422	July 12, 1922.
Rutland, Mass.	do.	220	May, 1923.
Chelsea, N. Y. ³	do.	450	January, 1924.
Augusta, Ga.	Neuropsychiatric	265	January, 1923.
Oteen, N. C.	Tuberculosis	200	February, 1923.
Tuskegee, Ala.	do.	302	March, 1923.
Dayton, Ohio	Neuropsychiatric	294	March, 1923.
Marion, Ind.	Tuberculosis	302	January, 1923.
Milwaukee, Wis.	Neuropsychiatric	80	Do.
St. Louis, Mo.	General	612	Do.
Palo Alto, Calif.	Neuropsychiatric	250	March, 1923.
		515	February, 1923.

SECOND LANGLEY BILL.

Northampton, Mass.	Neuropsychiatric	436	February, 1924.
Tupper Lake, N. Y.	Tuberculosis	450	Do.
Memphis, Tenn.	General	200	August, 1922.
Gulfport, Miss. ⁴	Neuropsychiatric	250	February, 1924.
Chillicothe, Ohio.	do.	436	December, 1923.
Camp Custer, Mich.	do.	500	February, 1924.
Knoxville, Iowa ⁴	do.	440	August, 1923.
St. Cloud, Minn.	do.	250	February, 1924.
Livermore, Calif.	Tuberculosis	425	Do.
American Lake, Wash.	Neuropsychiatric	250	Do.
Aspinwall, Pa.	Tuberculosis	250	Do.
Excelsior Springs, Mo.	do.	75	August, 1923.

¹ But 80 beds initially made available on this date.

² But 455 at present available.

³ Contracts awarded only in part.

⁴ To replace 210 beds in temporary structures.

⁵ Existing hospital, 172 beds; proposed hospital to be of 440-bed capacity.

Vocational rehabilitation.

Date last application could be filed, December 16, 1922.

Number in training January 1, 1923, 97,035.

Estimated number in training January 1, 1924, 82,000.

Estimated number in training January 1, 1925, 42,000.

Average cost per trainee:

Tuition and supplies.....\$19.62

Allowance pay (this is average for total number in training in 1922).....108.70

Total.....128.32

[NOTE.—The law provides that training must be started within one year after filing application.]

Estimates for appropriation, medical and hospital services, major repairs, alterations, and new construction, fiscal year 1924.

No.	Location of station.	Ordinary repairs.	Approach work.	New construction.		Total.
				Imme- diately necessary.	Necessary in near future.	
24	Palo Alto, Calif.	\$25,000	\$8,000	\$253,000	\$286,000
25	Houston, Tex.	40,000	40,000
26	Greenville, S. C.	15,000	5,000	20,000
27	Alexandria, La.	25,000	7,000	32,000
30	Chicago, Ill.	7,000	7,000
32	Washington, D. C.	20,000	43,000	220,000	283,000

Estimates for appropriations, medical and hospital services, etc.—Contd.

No.	Location of station.	Ordinary repairs.	Approach work.	New construction.		Total.
				Imme- diately necessary.	Necessary in near future.	
35	St. Louis, Mo.					
37	Waukesha, Wis.	\$10,000	\$8,000		\$177,000	\$195,000
41	New Haven, Conn.	10,000				10,000
42	Perryville, Md.	20,000	40,000	\$150,675	577,395	788,070
44	West Roxbury, Mass.	10,000				10,000
48	Atlanta, Ga.	10,000	4,000		50,000	64,000
49	Philadelphia, Pa.	15,000				15,000
50	Whipple Barracks, Ariz.	45,000	15,000	117,500	25,000	202,500
51	Tucson, Ariz.	7,000				7,000
52	Boise, Idaho	20,000	7,000			27,000
54	Arrowhead Springs, Calif.	15,000				15,000
55	Fort Bayard, N. Mex.	50,000	25,000		125,000	200,000
57	Knoxville, Iowa	20,000	12,000			32,000
59	Tacoma, Wash.	10,000				10,000
60	Oteen, N. C.	40,000	12,000			52,000
62	Augusta, Ga.	20,000	15,000	637,500		672,500
63	Lake City, Fla.	18,000	30,000		121,000	169,000
64	Camp Kearney, Calif.	15,000				15,000
65	St. Paul, Minn.	10,000				10,000
67	Kansas City, Mo.	7,500				7,500
68	Minneapolis, Minn.	7,000				7,000
69	Fort Thomas, Ky.	6,000				6,000
72	Helena, Mont.	25,000	8,000		131,000	164,000
74	Gulfport, Miss.	25,000	10,000			35,000
76	Maywood, Ill.	25,000	10,000		45,000	80,000
77	Portland, Oreg.	8,000				8,000
78	North Little Rock, Ark.	20,000	15,000	90,000	416,000	541,000
79	Dawsonsprings, Ky.	20,000	20,000		173,000	213,000
81	Bronx, N. Y.	80,000	35,000	365,000		480,000
84	Algiers, La.	15,000	5,000		5,000	25,000
85	Walla Walla, Wash.	20,000	10,000	30,000	120,000	180,000
86	Sheridan, Wyo.	20,000	8,000		125,000	153,000
87	Chillicothe, Ohio.	6,000	5,000			11,000
88	Memphis, Tenn.	8,000				8,000
	Rutland, Mass.	10,000	10,000	108,500		128,500
	Jefferson Barracks, Mo.	10,000	8,000	76,000	5,000	99,000
	Tuskegee, Ala.	15,000	20,000	90,000		125,000
	Aspinwall, Pa.	10,000				10,000
	Chelsea, N. Y.	10,000				10,000
	Excelsior Springs, Mo.	10,000	8,000			18,000
	Northampton, Mass.	15,000				15,000
	Tupper Lake, N. Y.	15,000				15,000
	Camp Custer, Mich.	5,000	10,000			15,000
	St. Cloud, Minn.	5,000	10,000			15,000
	Livermore, Calif.	5,000	10,000			15,000
	American Lake, Wash.	10,000	10,000			20,000
	Muskogee, Okla.	15,000				15,000
	Dispensaries.	250,000				250,000
	Total.	1,104,500	443,000	1,665,175	2,568,395	5,781,070

United States Veterans' Hospital No. 24, Palo Alto, Calif.

PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE, FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs.....	\$25,000
Approach work.....	8,000
Total.....	\$33,000
Expended, fiscal year 1922.....	\$54,805.89
Allotted, fiscal year 1923.....	8,000.00

NEW CONSTRUCTION.

Employees' quarters (70 beds).....	\$125,000
Recreation building.....	40,000
Occupational therapy building.....	15,000
Laundry (complete).....	40,000
Refrigerating plant.....	15,000
Garage.....	6,000
Bakery.....	7,000
Nurses' kitchen.....	5,000

Total.....253,000

Grand total.....286,000

Certain permanent facilities are being provided by the Office of the Supervising Architect from funds allotted by the White committee, and additional facilities noted above are needed to make a complete hospital. The new construction above is for N. P. unit.

The item for approach work is to provide roads and sidewalks not included in construction program and for upkeep of the grounds. Government-owned land, 91.5 acres; Government-owned buildings, 8. Tuberculosis hospital—capacity, 514.

United States Veterans' Hospital No. 25, Houston, Tex.

PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE, FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs.....	\$40,000.00
Expended fiscal year 1922.....	14,541.34
Allotted fiscal year 1923.....	40,000.00

The Supervising Architect was making certain alterations at this station during fiscal year 1923, and this accounts for small expenditure for repairs. Practically all buildings at this station are temporary frame structures, and amount allotted for fiscal year 1922 and estimated for fiscal year 1924 will be necessary to keep the buildings in good condition.

Leased land, 209 acres; Government-owned buildings, 75.

General hospital—capacity, 700.

*United States Veterans' Hospital No. 26, Greenville, S. C.*PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE,
FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$15,000.00
Approach work	5,000.00
Expended fiscal year 1922	7,707.63
Allotted fiscal year 1923	25,000.00

The Supervising Architect was remodeling buildings at this station during fiscal year 1922, which accounts for the small expenditure for repairs. Buildings are temporary frame structures, and amount requested will be necessary to keep station in proper condition.
Leased land, 234 acres; Government-owned buildings, 96.
Tuberculosis hospital—capacity, 500.

*United States Veterans' Hospital No. 27, Alexandria, La.*PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE FISCAL
YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$25,000.00
Approach work	7,000.00
Total	32,000.00

Expended for repairs, fiscal year 1922	11,906.45
Allotted for repairs, fiscal year 1923	25,000.00
Allotted for special work, fiscal year 1923	30,000.00

The Supervising Architect was remodeling buildings at this station during fiscal year 1922, which accounts for small expenditure for repairs, and the expenditure of the amount allotted for current year has been authorized. All buildings are temporary frame structures, and the amount estimated will be necessary to keep them in good condition.

Leased land, 160 acres; Government-owned buildings, 63.
T. B. hospital—capacity, 400.

*United States Veterans' Hospital No. 30, Chicago, Ill.*PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE, FISCAL
YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$7,000
Expended fiscal year 1922	1,600
Allotted fiscal year 1923	32,000

Allotment for current year included repairs and restoration of main building.
Estimate is for annex only on information that main hospital is to be closed.

Buildings and grounds leased; capacity, No. 30, 550.
General hospital, annex, 100.

*United States Veterans' Hospital No. 32, Washington, D. C.*PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE,
FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$20,000
Approach work	43,000
Total	\$63,000

Expended fiscal year 1922	\$3,135.28
Allotted fiscal year 1923 (repairs)	15,000.00
Allotted fiscal year 1923 (special work)	20,000.00

NEW CONSTRUCTION.

Nurses' quarters (30 rooms)	\$80,000
Attendants' quarters—add story on garage	15,000
Recreation building	35,000
Occupational therapy	15,000
Colored tuberculosis ward (35 beds)	50,000
Storage warehouse	25,000

Total	220,000
-------	---------

Grand total	283,000
-------------	---------

The estimate for approach work included retaining wall, new roads and repairs to old roads, fences, etc., and is absolutely necessary for protection of the property.

Nurses are now occupying one of the ward buildings, and new quarters will release this space for patients.

Colored tuberculosis patients now housed in temporary frame building which is in very bad condition and at all times a fire menace.

Government-owned land, 3½ acres; Government-owned buildings, 9.
General hospital—capacity, 230.

*United States Veterans' Hospital No. 35, St. Louis, Mo.*PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE,
FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Decision of Comptroller General prohibits funds being expended at this station.

*United States Veterans' Hospital No. 37, Waukesha, Wis.*PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE,
FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$10,000.00
Approach work	8,000.00
Expended fiscal year 1922	\$2,736.53
Allotted fiscal year 1923	10,000.00

NEW CONSTRUCTION.

Quarters for Medical Officers' Corps and junior officers	\$65,000.00
Attendants' quarters (60 beds)	65,000.00
Nurses' quarters (30 beds)	47,000.00

Total	177,000.00
-------	------------

Amount for approach work is for repairs to roads reported by a representative of the Supervising Architect and general upkeep of the grounds.

New construction is needed in order to make a complete well-rounded hospital and properly house the personnel.

Government-owned land; Government-owned buildings, 6.
N. P. hospital—capacity, 724.

*United States Veterans' Hospital No. 41, New Haven, Conn.*PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE,
FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$10,000.00
Expended fiscal year 1922	4,566.69
Allotted fiscal year 1923 (repairs)	15,000.00
Allotted fiscal year 1923 (special work)	35,000.00

Amount allotted for special work included additions and facilities. This work has been held in abeyance.

Leased buildings and land; some Government-owned temporary buildings.

Tuberculosis hospital—capacity, 500.

*United States Veterans' Hospital No. 42, Perryville, Md.*PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE,
FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$20,000.00
Approach work	40,000.00
Expended, fiscal year 1922	\$154,814.88
Allotted, fiscal year 1923	20,000.00

NEW CONSTRUCTION.

Nurses quarters (62 beds)	\$72,400.00
Male attendants' quarters (60 beds)	53,000.00
Recreation building	42,500.00
Occupational therapy	25,000.00
Diagnostic building (100 beds) and professional utilities	260,000.00
Acute building (30 beds) ¹	70,000.00
Increase in mess and kitchen	35,000.00
Tuberculosis building (15 beds)	30,000.00
Attendants—colored (24 rooms) ¹	20,500.00
New barn	15,000.00
Additional roads and sidewalks	40,000.00
Extensions to water, lighting, heating, and sewer facilities	30,000.00

Total	593,400.00
Five per cent contingencies	34,670.00

\$728,070.00

Total 788,070.00

Certain permanent facilities have been provided by the office of the Supervising Architect from funds allotted by the White committee, and additional facilities noted above are to take care of present activities and contemplated increase in capacity in permanent buildings.

Government-owned land, 516 acres; Government-owned buildings, 58.
N. P. hospital; capacity, 600.

*United States Veterans' Hospital No. 44, West Roxbury, Mass.*PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE,
FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$10,000.00
Expended, fiscal year 1922	\$35,000.00
Allotted, fiscal year 1923	27,000.00

Leased buildings and grounds.

N. P. hospital; capacity, 237.

*United States Veterans' Hospital No. 48, Atlanta, Ga.*PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE,
FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$10,000.00
Approach work	4,000.00

Expended, fiscal year 1922	\$2,978.46
Allotted, fiscal year 1923 (repairs)	7,500.00
Allotted, fiscal year 1923 (special work)	3,600.00

NEW CONSTRUCTION.

Medical officers' quarters	30,000.00
Recreation building	20,000.00

50,000.00

Total 64,000.00

There are no officers' quarters at this station, and recreation activities are housed in a temporary portable building.

Amount for special work to erect a cottage for administrative assistant.

Buildings were repaired and remodeled at this station during fiscal year 1922 by the Supervising Architect with funds provided from special appropriation.

Government-owned land, 21 acres; Government-owned buildings, 7.
General hospital; capacity, 105.

*United States Veterans' Hospital No. 49, Philadelphia, Pa.*PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE,
FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$15,000.00
Expended, fiscal year 1922	5,817.14
Allotted, fiscal year 1923	24,000.00

Allotment for current year includes repainting all buildings at station.

Government-owned land; Government-owned buildings, 27.
N. P. hospital; capacity, 420.

*United States Veterans' Hospital No. 50, Whipple Barracks, Ariz.*PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE,
FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$45,000
Approach work	15,000

\$60,000

Expended fiscal year 1922	\$2,132.52
Allotted fiscal year 1923	44,000.00

¹ Immediately necessary.

NEW CONSTRUCTION.

Nurses' quarters ¹	\$85,000
Officers' quarters (2 double sets)	25,000
Kitchens ¹	30,000
Toilets and baths ¹	2,500
Total	142,500
Total	202,500

Certain permanent facilities are being provided by the Office of the Supervising Architect from funds allotted by the White committee, and in order to facilitate the administration of this hospital the new construction noted above is necessary.

Construction work by the Supervising Architect was under way during 1922.

Government-owned land; Government-owned buildings, 71.

T. B. hospital, capacity, 823.

United States Veterans' Hospital No. 51, Tucson, Ariz.

PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE, FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$7,000.00
Expended fiscal year 1922	37,601.98
Allotted fiscal year 1923	7,000.00
Government-owned land, 25 acres; Government-owned buildings, 73.	
T. B. hospital, capacity, 260.	

United States Veterans' Hospital No. 52, Boise, Idaho.

PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE, FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$20,000.00
Approach work	7,000.00
Total	27,000.00

Expended fiscal year 1922	2,402.15
Allotted fiscal year 1923	8,000.00

Government-owned buildings and land: Revocable permit from War Department granting Public Health Service use of certain buildings and grounds, Public Health Service to keep all structures and facilities in good repair.

Government-owned land, 636.35 acres; Government-owned buildings, 28.

General hospital—capacity, 215.

United States Veterans' Hospital No. 54, Arrowhead Springs, Calif.

PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE, FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$15,000.00
Expended fiscal year 1922	25,000.00
Allotted fiscal year 1923	10,000.00

Leased land; leased buildings.

General hospital—capacity, 175.

United States Veterans' Hospital No. 55, Fort Bayard, N. Mex.

PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE, FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$50,000.00
Approach work	25,000.00
Total	75,000.00

Expended fiscal year 1922	\$13,880.90
Allotted fiscal year 1923	52,500.00

NEW CONSTRUCTION.

Relocation of farm activities	125,000.00
-------------------------------	------------

Total	200,000.00
-------	------------

Government reservation loaned to Veterans' Bureau by the War Department for any indefinite period. Certain permanent facilities are being provided by the Office of the Supervising Architect from funds allotted by the White committee, and it is desired to remove the dairy farm, hog farm, and all other farm activities to a more suitable location.

Government-owned land; Government-owned buildings, 302.

T. B. hospital—capacity, 1,200.

United States Veterans' Hospital No. 57, Knoxville, Iowa.

PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE, FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$20,000
Approach work	12,000
Total	32,000

Expended fiscal year 1922	17,000
Allotted fiscal year 1923	16,000

New construction being handled by Construction Division, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, from funds provided by second Langley bill.

Amount for approach work is to cover laying out and upkeep of the grounds after construction work is completed.

Government-owned land; capacity at present, 172.

United States Veterans' Hospital No. 59, Tacoma, Wash.

PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE, FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$10,000
Expended fiscal year 1922	11,000
Allotted fiscal year 1923	10,000

Leased land, 48 acres; leased buildings, 42.

Tuberculosis hospital; capacity 302.

¹ Immediately necessary.

United States Veterans' Hospital No. 60, Otten, N. C.

PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE, FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$40,000.00
Approach work	12,000.00
Total	52,000.00

Expended fiscal year 1922	114,180.85
Allotted fiscal year 1923	40,000.00

Certain permanent construction being provided by the Office of the Supervising Architect from funds allotted by the White committee, and repairs to certain buildings from funds provided by special appropriation.

Amount for approach work is to cover laying out and upkeep of grounds after construction is completed.

Government-owned land, 337.2 acres; Government-owned buildings, 117.

Tuberculosis hospital; capacity, 1,100.

United States Veterans' Hospital, No. 62, Augusta, Ga.

PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE, FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$20,000
Approach work	15,000
Total	\$35,000
Expended fiscal year 1922	\$5,080.78
Allotted fiscal year 1923	35,500.00

NEW CONSTRUCTION.

Remodel Lenwood Hotel property ¹	\$150,000
Quarters medical officer in charge ¹	14,000
Nurses' quarters (85 rooms) ¹	115,000
Female attendants' quarters (30 rooms) ¹	50,000
Male attendants' quarters (110 rooms) ¹	180,000
Garage (15 cars) ¹	6,000
Laundry ¹	40,000
Storage warehouse ¹	25,000
Four buildings for married and single officers ¹	57,500
Total	637,500

Total	672,500
-------	---------

Certain permanent facilities are being provided by the Office of the Supervising Architect from funds allotted by the White committee. The new construction noted above is necessary to make the main building safe for the housing of patients, to provide suitable housing for personnel, and provide needed capacity.

Government-owned land, 333 acres; Government-owned buildings, 33.

N. P. hospital; capacity, 250.

United States Veterans' Hospital, No. 63, Lake City, Fla.

PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE, FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$18,000
Approach work	30,000
Total	\$48,000
Expended fiscal year 1922	\$2,020.48
Allotted fiscal year 1923	10,000.00

NEW CONSTRUCTION.

Five married officers' quarters	35,000
Occupational therapy	25,000
Garage and storehouse	11,000
Enlarging kitchen	50,000
Total	121,000

Total	169,000
-------	---------

Certain permanent facilities are being provided by the Office of the Supervising Architect from funds allotted by the White committee and this station is still in need of the new construction and remodeling noted above.

Government-owned land, 331 acres; Government-owned buildings, 21.

General hospital; capacity, 230.

United States Veterans' Hospital No. 64, Camp Kearney, Calif.

PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$15,000.00
Expended fiscal year 1922	7,915.53
Allotted fiscal year 1923	18,000.00

Leased land; Government-owned buildings.

T. B. Hospital; temporary frame.

United States Veterans' Hospital No. 65, St. Paul, Minn.

PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$10,000
Expended fiscal year 1922	46,500
Allotted fiscal year 1923	10,000

Leased land; leased buildings.

General hospital—capacity, 337.

United States Veterans' Hospital No. 67, Kansas City, Mo.

PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$7,500
Expended fiscal year 1922	36,000
Allotted fiscal year 1923	7,500

Leased land; leased buildings.

General hospital—capacity, 125.

¹ Immediately necessary.

United States Veterans' Hospital No. 68, Minneapolis, Minn.

PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$7,000
Expended fiscal year 1922	5,000
Allotted fiscal year 1923	7,000
Leased land; leased buildings.	
General hospital—capacity, 338.	

United States Veterans' Hospital No. 69, Fort Thomas, Ky.

PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE, FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$6,000
Expended fiscal year 1922	18,000
Allotted fiscal year 1923	6,000
Leased land; leased buildings.	
General hospital; capacity, 146.	

United States Veterans' Hospital No. 72, Helena, Mont.

PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE, FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$25,000.00
Approach work	8,000.00
Expended fiscal year 1922	1,391.75
Allotted fiscal year 1923	14,000.00
NEW CONSTRUCTION.	
Addition to dining room	10,000.00
Remodeling building No. 9	10,000.00
Remodeling building No. 28	26,000.00
Central heating plant	85,000.00
Total	131,000.00

During fiscal year 1922 certain repairs and alterations were being made by the Supervising Architect.

New construction is necessary to efficiently operate the institution at present capacity.

Government-owned land; Government-owned buildings, 45.

General hospital—capacity, 185.

United States Veterans' Hospital No. 74, Gulfport, Miss.

PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE, FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$25,000
Approach work	10,000
Expended fiscal year 1922	35,000
Allotted fiscal year 1923	120,000
New construction at this station from funds provided by the second Langley bill.	10,000

Government-owned land, 147 acres; Government-owned buildings, 26.

N. P. hospital—present capacity, 210 in temporary buildings; proposed capacity, 300.

United States Veterans' Hospital No. 76, Maywood, Ill.

PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE, FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$25,000.00
Approach work	10,000.00
Expended fiscal year 1922	\$42,911.66
Allotted fiscal year 1923	70,000.00
NEW CONSTRUCTION.	
Nurses' home	45,000.00
Total	45,000.00

Allotment for current year includes certain special work, in amount \$45,000.

Government-owned land, 320 acres; Government-owned buildings, 6.

General hospital—capacity, 925.

United States Veterans' Hospital No. 77, Portland, Oreg.

PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE, FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$8,000.00
Expended fiscal year 1922	20,000.00
Allotted fiscal year 1923	5,000.00
Leased land; leased building.	
General hospital—capacity, 150.	

United States Veterans' Hospital No. 78, North Little Rock, Ark.

PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE, FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$20,000.00
Approach work	15,000.00
Expended fiscal year 1922	\$778.46
Allotted fiscal year 1923	18,000.00

NEW CONSTRUCTION.

Acute patients building, 60 beds ¹	90,000.00
Semiacute patients buildings, 60 beds	60,000.00
Mild patients buildings, 60 beds	60,000.00
Tuberculosis patients building, 25 beds	40,000.00
Medical patients building, 60 beds	60,000.00
Male attendants' quarters, 115 beds	90,000.00
Nurses' quarters, 67 beds	70,000.00
Increase in power plant	10,000.00
Increase kitchen and mess	25,000.00
Remodel Building No. 3	1,000.00
Total	506,000.00

Total 541,000.00

¹ Immediately necessary.

Certain permanent facilities have been provided by the Office of the Supervising Architect from funds allotted by the White committee, and the new construction noted above is needed to make a complete, well-rounded hospital and to provide needed additional capacity.

Government-owned land, 1,088 acres; Government-owned buildings, 64.

N. P. hospital—capacity, 257.

United States Veterans' Hospital No. 79, Dawson Springs, Ky.

PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE, FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$20,000
Approach work	20,000
Expended fiscal year 1922	\$110,000.

NEW CONSTRUCTION.

Officers' quarters (2 sets double quarters, 5 rooms each)	\$25,000
Fireproof storage warehouse	35,000
Cyclone fence around station (about 1 mile)	15,000
Occupational therapy building	35,000
Post exchange building	15,000
Construction of 3½ miles of road	23,000
Swimming pool	25,000
Total	\$173,000

Total 213,000

NEW CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZED FROM CURRENT APPROPRIATIONS.

Officers' quarters (4 sets double quarters, 5 rooms each)	\$55,000
Recreation building for personnel	35,000
Extension of heating and service lines to take care of new construction, and correction of defects in heating system of present officers' quarters	10,000
Total	\$100,000

New construction noted above was not included in the original plans, and is needed to make a complete, well-rounded hospital.

Government-owned land; Government-owned buildings, 23.

T. B. hospital; capacity, 405.

United States Veterans Bureau Hospital No. 81, Bronx, N. Y.

PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE, FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$30,000
Approach work	35,000
Expended fiscal year, 1922	\$150.
Allotted fiscal year 1923	\$125,000.

NEW CONSTRUCTION.

Nurses' quarters ¹	200,000
Recreation ¹	60,000
Occupational therapy ¹	35,000
Storage warehouse ¹	35,000
Screens for buildings ¹	20,000
Dental unit ¹	15,000
Total	365,000

Total 430,000

Allotment for current year includes an item of \$100,000 for special work at the station.

Certain remodeling has been done by the Office of the Supervising Architect from funds allotted by the White committee, and the additional facilities noted above are needed to make a complete, well-rounded institution.

Government-owned land, 29,818 acres; Government-owned buildings, 7.

N. P. hospital; capacity, 1,000.

United States Veterans' Hospital No. 84, Algiers, La.

PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE, FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$15,000.00
Approach work	5,000.00
Expended, fiscal year 1922	\$20,000.00
Allotted, fiscal year 1923	21,709.46
NEW CONSTRUCTION.	14,000.00

Garage	5,000.00
Government-owned land, 9½ acres; Government-owned buildings, 22.	
General hospital; capacity, 201.	

United States Veterans Hospital No. 85, Walla Walla, Wash.

PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE, FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$20,000.00
Approach work	10,000.00
Expended, fiscal year 1922	\$30,000.00
Allotted, fiscal year 1923	329.16
NEW CONSTRUCTION.	25,000.00

Two new ward buildings (50 beds each)	\$120,000.00
Alterations, personnel quarters ¹	5,000.00
New administration buildings ¹	25,000.00
Total	150,000.00

Total 180,000.00

Certain alterations and increased facilities have been provided by the Office of the Supervising Architect from funds allotted by the White committee, and the new construction noted above is necessary to provide facilities for the increased capacity.

Government-owned land, 640 acres; Government-owned buildings, 57.

Tuberculosis hospital; capacity, 215.

¹ Immediately necessary.

*United States Veterans' Hospital No. 86, Sheridan, Wyo.*PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE,
FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$20,000.00	
Approach work	8,000.00	
		\$28,000.00
Expended fiscal year 1922	4,057.85	
Allotted fiscal year 1923	30,000.00	
NEW CONSTRUCTION.		
Central heating plant	125,000.00	
		125,000.00
Total		153,000.00

Under available appropriation the Office of the Supervising Architect remodeled certain buildings to accommodate 245 patients, and new construction noted above is necessary to develop the full capacity of existing buildings and to provide a complete well-rounded institution. Government-owned land, 5,440 acres; Government-owned buildings, 50. N. P. hospital; capacity, 245.

*United States Veterans' Hospital No. 87, Chillicothe, Ohio.*PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE,
FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$6,000.00	
Approach work	5,000.00	
		11,000.00
Government-owned land; Government-owned buildings, 7. General hospital; capacity, 58.		

*United States Veterans' Hospital No. 88, Memphis, Tenn.*PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE,
FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$8,000.00	
Allotment fiscal year 1923	10,000.00	
Government-owned land; Government-owned buildings. General hospital; capacity, 165.		

*United States Veterans' Hospital No. 89, Rutland, Mass.*PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE,
FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$10,000.00	
Approach work	10,000.00	
		\$20,000.00
Allotted fiscal year 1923, \$11,000.00.		

NEW CONSTRUCTION.

Occupational therapy and recreation building ¹	\$30,000.00	
Quarters for medical officers in charge (7 rooms) ¹	14,000.00	
Double quarters, chiefs of staff (6 rooms each) ¹	21,000.00	
Three sets double quarters, officers (5 rooms each) ¹	40,000.00	
Addition to bakery to present kitchen ¹	3,500.00	
		108,500.00
Total		128,500.00

Certain permanent facilities are being provided by the Office of the Supervising Architect from funds allotted by the White committee, and the new construction noted above is necessary to provide a complete well-rounded institution. Government-owned land; Government-owned buildings. T. B. hospital; capacity, 220.

*United States Veterans' Hospital, Jefferson Barracks, Mo.*PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE,
FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$10,000.00	
Approach work	8,000.00	
		\$18,000.00
Allotted fiscal year 1923	\$5,500.00	
NEW CONSTRUCTION.		

Resident medical officer in charge ¹	\$11,000.00	
Quarters for officers (4) ¹	25,000.00	
Quarters, female attendants ¹	40,000.00	
Increased boiler capacity	5,000.00	
		81,000.00
Total		99,000.00

This hospital was developed by the Office of the Supervising Architect from funds allotted by the White committee, and new constructions noted above are necessary to provide a complete well-rounded institution. Government-owned. General; capacity, 250.

*United States Veterans' Hospital, Tuskegee, Ala.*PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE,
FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$15,000.00	
Approach work	20,000.00	
		\$35,000.00
Allotted fiscal year 1923	\$10,000.00	
NEW CONSTRUCTION.		

Recreation building and occupational therapy building ¹	55,000.00	
Storage warehouse ¹	35,000.00	
		90,000.00
Total		125,000.00

The hospital is being constructed by the Office of the Supervising Architect from funds allotted by the White committee, and new construction noted above is necessary to provide a complete well-rounded institution. Government-owned land; Government-owned buildings. Tuberculosis unit; capacity, 302. Neuropsychiatric unit; capacity, 294.

¹ Immediately necessary.*United States Veterans' Hospital, Excelsior Springs, Mo.*PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE,
FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$10,000.00	
Approach work	8,000.00	
		18,000.00
Allotted fiscal year 1923	275,000.00	
Allotment for current fiscal year includes an item of \$270,000 for new construction.		

Construction probably completed about August 1, 1923. Government-owned land; Government-owned building. Tuberculosis hospital; capacity, 125.

*United States Veterans' Hospital, Aspinwall, Pa.*PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE,
FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$10,000	
Plan of this station not sufficiently advanced to permit an estimate of additional construction needed.		
Construction being handled by the Office of the Supervising Architect from funds allotted by the White committee, probably completed about July 1, 1923.		
Government-owned land; Government-owned buildings. Tuberculosis hospital; capacity, 120.		

*United States Veterans' Hospital, Chelsea, N. Y.*PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE,
FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$10,000	
Plans of this station not sufficiently advanced to permit an estimate of the additional construction needed.		
Construction being handled by the Office of the Supervising Architect from funds allotted by the White committee.		
Government-owned land; Government-owned buildings. Tuberculosis hospital; capacity, probably 236		

*United States Veterans' Hospital, Northampton, Mass.*PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE,
FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$15,000	
Government-owned land; Government-owned buildings. N. P. hospital; capacity, 436 beds.		

*United States Veterans' Hospital, Tupper Lake, N. Y.*PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE,
FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$15,000	
Government-owned land; Government-owned buildings. Tuberculosis hospital; capacity, 450 beds.		

*United States Veterans' Hospital, Camp Custer, Mich.*PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE,
FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$5,000	
Development of grounds	10,000	
		15,000
Plans now being prepared by Army construction; probably completed about September 1, 1923.		

Government-owned land; Government-owned buildings. N. P. hospital; capacity, 500.

*United States Veterans' Hospital, St. Cloud, Minn.*PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE,
FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$5,000	
Approach work	10,000	
		15,000
Plans now being prepared for construction; probably completed about September 1, 1923.		

Government-owned land; Government-owned buildings. N. P. hospital; capacity, 250.

*United States Veterans' Hospital, Livermore, Calif.*PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE,
FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$5,000	
Development of grounds	10,000	
		15,000
Plans now being prepared for construction; probably completed July 1, 1923.		

Government-owned land; Government-owned buildings. Tuberculosis hospital—capacity, 425.

*United States Veterans' Hospital, American Lake, Wash.*PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE,
FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs	\$10,000	
Approach work	10,000	
		20,000
Plans now being drawn; construction probably completed about August 1, 1923.		

Government-owned land; Government-owned buildings. N. P. hospital—capacity, 250.

*United States Veterans' Hospital, Muskogee, Okla.*PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE,
FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs, etc.	\$15,000	
Under consideration by bureau for lease.		

*United States Veterans' Bureau dispensaries.*PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE,
FISCAL YEAR 1924.

Ordinary repairs and upkeep	\$250,000	
-----------------------------	-----------	--

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has stated the present situation in reference to the second so-called Langley bill, which authorized the expenditure of \$17,000,000 for providing hospitalization facilities. It will be recalled that this bill was recommended and reported for passage by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. The same committee reported and recommended the first so-called Langley bill, which is known as the act of March 4, 1921. This authorized an expenditure of \$18,000,000 for hospitalization purposes.

I have thought that the Members of the House and perhaps the people of the country would be interested in knowing the present status of the expenditures authorized by this first Langley bill of March 4, 1921, and I therefore procured from the Assistant Secretary, Mr. Edward Clifford, who is in charge of the Supervising Architect's Office in the Treasury Department, a statement showing the projects, the allotments of

money, the number of beds contemplated, the type of hospital, the contract time for completion, and the present condition with reference to the completion of the various establishments that were included in the expenditures under the authorization of the act of March 4, 1921, and I ask unanimous consent to insert that statement in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the statement referred to:

JANUARY 10, 1923.

Hon. CARL R. CHINDBLOM,
United States House of Representatives.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In accordance with your request, I am sending you herewith memorandum showing hospital construction under the act of March 4, 1921, authorizing \$18,000,000 for that purpose.

Very truly yours,

EDWARD CLIFFORD,
Assistant Secretary.

Hospital.	Allotted.	Number of beds contemplated.	Type.	Contract time for completion of hospitals.	Actual time of completion.
Providence Hospital No. 2, Fort Logan H. Roots, Little Rock, Ark.	\$250,000.00	270	Neuropsychiatric.....	June 6, 1922.....	Completed and transferred to U. S. Veterans' Bureau.
United States Veterans' Hospital No. 27, Alexandria, La.	59,516.17	None.	Tuberculosis.....	do.....	Do.
United States Veterans' Hospital No. 63, Lake City, Fla.	272,000.00	100	do.....	Aug. 25, 1922.....	Do.
United States Veterans' Hospital No. 50, Prescott, Ariz. (Whipple Barracks).	577,000.00	422	do.....	July 12, 1922.....	Do.
Fort McKenzie, Wyo.	177,000.00	245	Neuropsychiatric.....	June 7, 1922.....	Do.
Providence Hospital No. 1, Fort Walla Walla, Wash.	450,000.00	165	Tuberculosis.....	July 13, 1922.....	Do.
United States Veterans' Hospital, No. 81, Bronx, New York City.	3,485,000.00	1,011	Neuropsychiatric.....	July 23, 1922.....	Do.
United States Veterans' Hospital No. 55, Fort Bayard, N. Mex.	992,500.00	250	Tuberculosis.....	July 11, 1922.....	Do.
United States Veterans' Hospital No. 42, Perryville, Md.	483,000.00	300	Neuropsychiatric.....	do.....	Do.
Providence Hospital No. 4, Rutland, Mass.	815,000.00	220	Tuberculosis.....	September, 1922.....	Do.
United States Veterans' Hospital No. 62, Augusta, Ga.	870,783.00	265	Neuropsychiatric.....	Oct. 10, 1922.....	Do.
National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, Milwaukee, Wis.	1,400,000.00	612	Tuberculosis.....	Jan. 1, 1923.....	Practically complete.
National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, Dayton, Ohio.	750,000.00	305	do.....	do.....	Do.
National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, Marion, Ind.	100,000.00	80	Neuropsychiatric.....	do.....	Do.
United States Veterans' Hospital No. 60, Oteen, N. C.	458,000.00	200	Tuberculosis.....	do.....	92 per cent complete; contract.
United States Veterans' Hospital No. 24, Palo Alto, Calif.	1,303,619.65	515	Neuropsychiatric.....	December, 1922.....	99 per cent complete; contract.
Negro hospital, Tuskegee, Ala.	1,985,000.00	302	Tuberculosis.....	February, 1923.....	Do.
St. Louis, Mo. (Jefferson Barracks)	1,265,000.00	294	Neuropsychiatric.....	do.....	85 per cent complete; contract.
Chelsea, N. Y. (metropolitan district)	2,000,000.00	250	General.....	March, 1923.....	Contract awarded Oct. 23, 1922, for major portion of work.
Miscellaneous hospitals.	73,181.25	400	Tuberculosis.....	Infirmaries, July 23, 1921.	
Equipment.	600,000.00				
Total.....	18,366,600.07	6,207			

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield just at that point?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. How does the matter of expedition in the construction of that group of buildings compare with the expedition under the \$17,000,000 appropriation?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I will say to the gentleman that the statement shows that more than one-half of the projects are now completed; that 11 out of 19 projects are now completed; that the balance of them are more than 90 per cent complete, with the exception of the single project at Chelsea, N. Y., in the metropolitan district of New York, for which the contract was awarded October 23, 1922. That work was delayed because of the inability of the people interested in that section of the country to agree upon a location. These 11 projects which are already completed and which have been transferred to the Veterans' Bureau involve an expenditure of \$8,431,799.17, and provide facilities for 3,248 patients. The entire appropriation has been used to the extent of \$18,366,600.07, and provides for 6,207 patients, making an average cost of about \$3,000 per bed.

There was in the House and in Committee of the Whole considerable discussion about the efficiency and the competency of the Supervising Architect's Office in the matter of erecting these hospital buildings, and largely on that account, as well as on account of the interest which exists with reference to the present hospital situation, I have taken the time of the House for these few minutes to show the situation and to have this statement inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes.

Mr. REED of New York. Does the program for these various hospitals provide for employees and doctors?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The appropriation did not provide for the personnel, but it will pay for some of the equipment. You understand that all these buildings are erected by the Supervising Architect's Office and turned over, when completed, to the Veterans' Bureau for use and occupancy by them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For printing and binding for the United States Veterans' Bureau, including all of its bureaus, offices, institutions, and services located in Washington, D. C., and elsewhere, \$300,000.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, some two years ago I came before you pleading the merits of Fort Walla Walla as a desirable place for the establishment of a veterans' hospital.

During the preceding year I had repeatedly tried to secure the consent of the Secretary of War [Mr. Baker] for the use of these grounds and buildings for hospital purposes. Although they had not been used for military purposes for 11 years the Secretary steadfastly refused. Whereupon the matter was presented to the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee. After thorough investigation and consideration that committee, at my request, wrote into their hospital bill of two years ago a provision for the utilization of this splendid site and buildings for hospital purposes.

To-day I present to you some wonderfully artistic photographs made by my friend and fellow townsman, Mr. John W. Langdon, banker, business man, artist, and philanthropist, of Walla Walla, Wash.

In these pictures [exhibiting] which Mr. Langdon has made especially for you you will see the medical officers' quarters, nurses' home, superintendent's home, and various brick buildings occupied by the patients. I invite your especial attention to the neat and attractive appearance of all buildings and to the numerous shade trees and flowers. In this picture you see a strip of woodland and a brook. The grounds comprise more than 600 acres, 60 acres of which is wooded and is being converted into a natural park for the patients. Six streams of living water flow through the tract, affording sufficient water for the irrigation of 150 acres of unusually fertile garden land at some later date.

The buildings are all located on a low ridge which lifts them above the surrounding country and affords an excellent view of the city of Walla Walla, a mile away, the orchards, the garden tracts, the wheat fields, and the valley skirted by the Blue Mountains, 10 miles away.

Mr. BLANTON. How many patients have we there now?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. We have 138 patients and capacity for 100 more. Medical officers who have been stationed at several other institutions tell me that in climate and general attractiveness that this Veterans' Hospital 85, at Walla Walla, surpasses all others with which they are familiar.

I have repeatedly visited every part of this institution; I have repeatedly talked with each and every patient; I have inspected the kitchens; I have eaten of the same food at the same table with the patients. The medical staff, the nurses, and all others who serve the patients, in my opinion, are fully competent.

The citizens, and especially the good women of Walla Walla, are making lawns, planting shrubs and flowers, and in every way possible are beautifying the grounds and adding to the attractiveness of the institution and the comfort and amusement of the patients.

As a physician of many years' experience, I have often stated that in my opinion if a patient can recover in any hospital, any place, he can recover in this institution.

But we can not understand why patients are maintained in private institutions in the thirteenth district when beds and every other facility await them here. When more accommodations are needed in the Northwest, the great expanse of grounds, the large heating plant already installed, the water system, fire protection, laundry facilities, walks, parks, roadways, and general overhead all mark this as the logical location for expansion.

Abundant grounds are also available for the establishment of a vocational training center. The climate and soil especially adapt it for the growing of all sorts of fruits, berries, and vegetables; for dairying, poultry, and bee culture. Shops and patients' quarters could be heated, lighted, watered, and provided with sewage facilities from the same systems now supplying the hospital. Every consideration of adaptability, desirability, and economy seem to warrant the training of ex-service men at this place.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I want to place before the House a few observations just in the way of food for thought. I do not want to make any startling disclosures or even to criticize the committee who have this measure in charge. At the outset I want to state that the subcommittee, according to the record, gave only two days' hearings to the Veterans' Bureau. I think even the committee will agree that the Veterans' Bureau, spending something like \$500,000,000 a year, is entitled to a little more consideration than two days. In fact, the Veterans' Bureau spends more money than the War or Navy Department. We have no committee in the House actually looking after the various items in this tremendous undertaking of affording veterans relief. Of course, we have the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, but that committee is too busy. Its calendar is overcrowded, and it is unable to give any consideration to the workings of the Veterans' Bureau. I am sure no member of the committee will challenge that statement. They have not given one hour's consideration in the last year to the question of veterans' relief, and I think this is as good a time as any to present these facts to the Members of Congress, so that they will be able in the future to make up their minds as to the advisability and justice of having a new committee to handle all soldiers' relief legislation arising out of the World War. For example, let me ask the chairman of the subcommittee if he knows how much rent is being paid for the district office at Boston?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes; we have the statement of the officer in charge of the Veterans' Bureau as to how much is being paid.

Mr. BRIGGS. How much is it?

Mr. FISH. I think if the House knew how much is being paid for rent in Boston the Members would agree that there is need for a committee to deal with the various ramifications of the Veterans' Bureau, including the contracts entered into for renting offices, hospitals, and schools.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. They are paying rent in Boston because we have no Government property there that is available. Some of the activities of the Veterans' Bureau, in New York especially, are conducted in Government buildings. We are using Government property where it is available, and where it is not available, in order that the veterans may not suffer in consequence, we are paying rent.

Mr. BRIGGS. What is the amount the Government is paying for rent in Boston?

Mr. FISH. I can tell the gentleman, to save time.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Boston is included in district No. 1, and the allowance for rentals there is \$189,214.

Mr. FISH. I think the House would like to know what they are paying for the district office at Boston. The rent for those offices is \$156,000 a year, with extras for lighting, and so forth, which are not down there.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The gentleman is not objecting to our paying it, is he?

Mr. FISH. I am certainly objecting when you can get suitable offices for \$9,000, and I understand that they are going to get them to-day. I am just pointing out that the subcommittee can not go into these items in two days of hearings.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will say that we did it. We went into it two years ago, and in consequence of our going into it we made quite a saving in the city of New York. Their offices there were down in a portion of the city where rents were high, and this activity could be taken care of just as well on the outskirts.

Mr. FISH. Yes; but this rent in Boston has been going on for a number of years. I believe it has just been called to the attention of Colonel Forbes, and he has taken steps to get suitable quarters at about one-seventeenth of the rent that we have been paying. We have been paying this extra money right along for nothing. What I say here is not a criticism of Colonel Forbes, because I think he is doing as well as he can under the circumstances.

Mr. BLANTON. Before the gentleman leaves Boston, will he permit a question?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman asked about the rent in Boston. I wonder if the committee knows what that manager at Boston was doing when Director Forbes had to go up there and remove him.

Mr. FISH. That is past history. I wonder if the chairman of the subcommittee can tell me what is the necessity of paying \$153,000 for the rent of the vocational school at Novo?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No; I do not think there is any necessity for it, and instead of that being a matter of criticism against the committee—

Mr. FISH. No; my object is to bring the matter before the House and not to make any reflection whatever on the committee or Colonel Forbes. I wish to avail myself of this opportunity to emphasize the necessity of creating a new committee to handle veteran relief legislation.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. That is purely a matter of administration; and I will say to the gentleman that with a good economical business administration the affairs of this department could be conducted with a saving of many, many thousands of dollars to the United States Government. But we are not the administrative officers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. I will say to the gentleman that while we are expending \$153,000 for rent at Novo, wherever that is—it sounds like a brand of food; but I believe it is located in Illinois—we are vocationalizing 173 men there. That is almost \$1,000 a year per man for rent, to say nothing of the expense for teachers, supplies, food, and everything else, and for the other employees.

It is time that some committee of the House should go into this matter. What I want to do is to bring to the attention of the House some of the things which require special consideration in this enormous bureau, almost as large as any department.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Certainly.

Mr. REED of New York. Does the gentleman know why they are paying these exorbitant rents?

Mr. FISH. I can not say why they are paying \$153,000 at Novo, Ill. I should think that they might almost build a school for that sum.

Mr. REED of New York. Does the gentleman know whether other buildings are available?

Mr. FISH. I know that there must be other buildings available in the United States.

Mr. REED of New York. Has the gentleman looked into it?

Mr. FISH. Yes; I have given many hours to the investigation of the whole subject.

Mr. REED of New York. I think the House is very much interested in it.

Mr. FISH. At some future time these matters will all be placed before the House, and perhaps a good many others. I will say that in my own district the Treasury Department paid \$100,000 for property a few months ago which had been sold the year previously for \$27,000. I will say that the Veterans' Bureau, also in my own district, has rented some buildings for a school at \$60,000 a year, and I think lately it has been increased to \$75,000 a year. I believe they could have bought the whole property for that amount. My purpose now is to tell these matters in a general way, placing the information before the House, because the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has not got the time to look into the details and the subcommittee that has charge of the appropriations has not given sufficient time to find out the whys and the wherefores of these excessive rents.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman have three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman state what executive officers made the contracts for rent of buildings at these excessive rates? Who were they?

Mr. FISH. That depends on whether it was for a hospital, vocational school, or office space.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Either one or all.

Mr. FISH. Many were contracted for years ago, before Colonel Forbes came into the bureau.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. I am not asking about Mr. Forbes; I am asking who was responsible for these excessive rates for rent.

Mr. FISH. That is for the committee to find out.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. I would like the title of the office that did the business.

Mr. FISH. I do not care to implicate anyone at the present time.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. It looks like we are in the dark unless we know where the responsibility lies.

Mr. FISH. Let me say to the gentleman that you are absolutely in the dark and the House is absolutely in the dark, and will be until a new committee is created.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Can not we do something which will let in a little light?

Mr. FISH. How can the House do anything when you have the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that does not give the matter any consideration?

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. The gentleman from New York is well informed personally, and I should be glad to know who was responsible for these excessive contracts.

Mr. FISH. I am simply placing some information before the House to show the necessity of creating a new committee to handle all veterans' relief legislation.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Can not the matter be investigated by the appropriate committee?

Mr. FISH. That is the trouble. The Appropriations Committee has an excessive amount of work to transact and has been unable to give more than two days to the consideration of the Veterans' Bureau. That is in no way a criticism of the committee. I am simply calling it to the attention of the House. I admit that I have a resolution in my pocket to investigate the whole subject, but I am not prepared to say whether I will introduce it or not. I thank the Members of the House for their attention, but I will thank them more if they will give some real and immediate consideration to the changing of the rules and establishing a veteran relief committee.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. Is not there a Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department, and did not it conduct an investigation some time ago with reference to the activities of the Veterans' Bureau?

Mr. FISH. No; the Veterans' Bureau is a separate bureau and does not come under the Treasury Department.

Mr. BRIGGS. I understand that now, but just prior to the time that the transfer was made there was an investigation made by the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department when that department then had jurisdiction of the War Risk Bureau, as it was then called.

Mr. FISH. I never heard of any investigation of that kind.

Mr. JEFFERS of Alabama. Does the gentleman know how this legislation fell into the hands of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

Mr. FISH. That was before I came to the House. I have asked several Members about it but none of them seemed to understand the reason. Even if there was a reason it has not worked out well.

Mr. JEFFERS of Alabama. It is a busy committee.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Let me say that this bureau started purely as a matter of marine insurance. I had the responsibility devolve upon me to examine and settle the first accounts. It was a plan for marine insurance exclusively, and it was considered, of course, by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and everything followed in that line.

When the men came and the war insurance act was passed, then the proposition, which was purely commercial in the first place, gathered to itself the matter of insurance and benefits for soldiers.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. There are other committees that consider appropriations for the hospitalization of the World War veterans than the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations on Independent Offices. The subcommittee on the War Department made considerable investigation as to hospital accommodations for veterans in the Army hospitals. That same subcommittee has given consideration to the hospitalization for World War veterans in connection with the various branch homes of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers. A committee of surgeons, to which the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations just referred, recommended a proposition which was very sound from an economic standpoint, and that was to have the hospitals erected in connection with the existing soldiers' homes, distributed throughout the country, so that they could utilize the existing permanent establishments.

A year ago I was surprised in the hearings on the War Department appropriation bill to find that there were at that time 1,200 beds available for World War veterans, which would not be utilized by the Veterans' Bureau. This year's testimony only emphasizes the striking condition that although we have capacity in hospitals connected with the national soldiers' homes, capacity in the hospitals connected with the Army and with the Navy, yet the Veterans' Bureau will not utilize those hospitals to the capacity available.

When I interrupted the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE] it was in all candor. I assumed the hospital at Dawsonsprings was in his district. I had no desire to single out that hospital in not being filled to capacity from any other. Construction was authorized four years ago, to be under the Treasury Department. I well remember the fight upon the floor in respect to it. The fact that it was not opened sooner has been the subject of criticism on the part of the war veterans. No patient was received at the Dawsonsprings Hospital until April, 1922.

I said in my interruption in the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] that the capacity of that hospital was not utilized fully. It is not the only one. Hospitals all over the country, with accommodations that are available, of the highest type—and where can you find a hospital of a higher type than those of the Army—are not used. The hospital at Dawsonsprings has a capacity of 500, and I have confirmed my impression since I interrupted the gentleman, by telephoning to the Veterans' Bureau; and I am informed that there are only 347 patients there at the present time.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. The commanding officer of that hospital gave, as his reason why the 500 beds were not utilized, the fact that he had plenty of applications but that he wanted to take those in close proximity.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not know what the reason is. I just telephoned to Doctor Stewart, of the Veterans' Bureau, and he says that there are beds available there and that they have no occupants.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Because they would not permit the transfers.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am criticizing this policy, wherever the responsibility lodges, of the Veterans' Bureau not utilizing present existing available beds. We have had available accommodations for years and years, and yet they are going ahead and establishing new hospitals throughout the country, when there will be no need for them because everyone knows that the peak of necessity for this service has passed.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, with reference to where the responsibility rests for this wholesale, wanton, and unreasonable extravagance, I am reminded of a charge I heard a Federal judge deliver to a grand jury once. He was talking about train robberies, and he said that the railroads were reaping what they had sown. He said that for the last 25 years every railroad had permitted the peddling on their trains of books on the lives of highway robbers, and that they are now reaping their reward. Congress is now reaping the fruits of its own folly in decentralizing the Veterans' Bureau. When the bill was before the House about August, 1921, I offered an amendment striking out the paragraph providing for decentralization, because I thought I foresaw the very trouble that we are now having. I said at the time that it was unnecessary to decentralize it, that it would scatter the records of the bureau all over the United States, and would greatly increase the expense of carrying on the work, and also increase the red tape and make it harder for the veteran to get the relief to which he is entitled. I am not like my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. FISH]. I do not mind saying where this responsibility rests. It can rest at but two places. One of them is with the Congress of the United States and the other is with the Director of the Veterans' Bureau. What is a director for? If you have directors of a bank and they permit a waste of money you hold them responsible. You have a man here who contracts for various things. We are told that he pays \$150,000 a year for office rent in one place and \$50,000 or \$60,000 for office rent in another. You are spending hundreds of millions of dollars a year more than is absolutely necessary to render the relief that the boys are now getting. A number of Members of Congress have expressed the regret to me at having voted for decentralizing, and, so far as I am concerned, I am in favor of recentralizing the Veterans' Bureau and placing it where Congress can supervise it. [Applause.]

I am not a bitter partisan, but it does not set very well with me to hear a Congressman of the party in power, having on his shoulders the responsibility that he has, show that some man, whether he be a director or head of a bureau or any other officer, is responsible by either his inability or his misconduct, or his inattentance to duty, for wholesale extravagance, and then decline to point that man out. I want to tell you there will have to be a recentralization of this Veterans' Bureau and a reduction of its expenses. I have worked hard, as has every other man here, to see that these disabled boys are taken care of, and we are going to see that they are cared for, but there are some other people whom we are going to have to take care of also, and they are the taxpayers of this country. It is costing from three and a half to four and a half billions of dollars a year at the present time to run this Government, from \$35 to \$45 per capita, or from \$180 to \$220 for the average family.

How long do you think the American people are going to stand for these extravagances? Are we not going to make any effort at all to reduce them? So far as I am concerned, if you will bring in a bill here any day, I do not care whether it is from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or not, bring in a bill from any authorized committee to recentralize the Veterans' Bureau, to investigate it, to cut out all these superfluous expenditures and bring its cost down to what it ought to be, I will support it and do everything I can to bring about its passage. But until you do that you are going to have the same trouble you are having to-day, and the longer it runs the more trouble you are going to have.

This decentralization was tried out on the Bureau of Pensions in years gone by, and it proved too costly and too cumbersome for the work to be done, just as the Veterans' Bureau is proving to be under the present régime. Let us recentralize it, increase its efficiency, and reduce expenditures. [Applause.]

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I had thought that the fight against the Dawsonsprings, Ky., hospital had long since been settled, but it seems that it is the delight of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], who fought it as much as he could in the Congress which passed the bill, to point out whatever he can against the Dawsonsprings hospital. Why, he says it has about 367 beds—

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINCHELOE. I will yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Did not we recently increase the appropriation \$750,000 for Dawsonsprings?

Mr. KINCHELOE. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. How much more do you need?

Mr. KINCHELOE. I am not talking about that. I am talking about the administration building hospitals at present. I want to get to the proposition of construction of these hospitals under that White commission, and I say it was a crime for its extravagances. That is what I am talking about. Let us take, for instance, the Dawsonsprings hospital, a magnificent institution—I think the most beautiful hospital I have ever seen in my life—and we have spent \$2,250,000 in the erection of that magnificent institution with 500 beds. Now, under this \$18,600,000 and under the \$17,000,000 we have given carte blanche to this commission. What is the definite thing to do? If you want to get more beds—that is what the Veterans' Bureau said; they wanted more beds, and want them now—why, for a nominal amount you can increase the capacity at Dawsonsprings to a thousand beds. How? You can build additional units. You have 5,000 acres of land which the people gave to the Government, and all you have got to do is to build the units, connect up the lighting and plumbing system and you can get double the capacity at one-fifth of the cost. Yet what did this commission do? It ran out and built these new hospitals, with all their overhead charges. Why, the gentleman from Wisconsin facetiously says that the hospital is not full.

No. I have talked with the people there, and they say that they have enough applications for transfer of boys from other institutions to fill this institution, but what the officer in charge wanted to do was to fill the institution, if he can, with boys from that particular portion of the United States; that is, as adjacent to that institution as possible. And, if this White commission under its \$18,500,000 appropriation would have gone out to existing hospitals, including Dawsonsprings, and doubled the bed capacity at one-fifth of the cost and in one-third of the time, we would have enough beds now to take care of all these boys. I do not want to inject politics into this thing, and I will only say that every time anything in reference to hospitals comes up Dawsonsprings seems to be the target. Now, when my bill became a law on March 3, 1919, when it came to a vote in this House, notwithstanding Secretary of Treasury McAdoo wrote a letter to the Speaker here saying that these boys needed hospitals, away back in 1918, you gentlemen treated it lightly, but when the bill finally came up for passage there was but one Republican Member of Congress who voted for it. That is the politics in it. But, as I say, I am not trying to inject any politics, but what I am trying to say is that we would have had enough beds for all these boys who are suffering if we had exercised some business judgment and extended the existing hospitals, and we could have saved millions of dollars. Personally I do not think there was any need for that \$17,000,000 appropriation, and if the money would have been wisely and economically expended you would not need another dollar to supply sufficient beds.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. The gentleman means the \$18,600,000—not the \$17,000,000?

Mr. KINCHELOE. Yes. I mean the \$18,600,000 appropriation. I wish some of you gentlemen interested in hospitals, you who seem to delight, and especially the gentleman from Wisconsin, in a reference of criticism to Dawsonsprings—I wish you would go and look at that magnificent institution. It will stand for itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move that the debate on this item be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana moves that the debate on this item be now closed. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the motion will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This appropriation shall be disbursed by the United States Veterans' Bureau, and such portion thereof as may be necessary shall be allotted from time to time to the Public Health Service, the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, and the War, Navy, and Interior Departments, and transferred to their credit for disbursement by them for the purposes set forth in the foregoing paragraph. The allotments to the said Board of Managers shall not be used to augment the appropriations made for the support of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOOD of Indiana: Page 39, in line 14, after the word "paragraph" and beginning with the word "the," strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I do this because it is permanent law now.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the statement of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], who has consistently fought centralization of the Veterans' Bureau, I want to say as one who advocated centralization that I believe it is worth the trouble. There may be some Congressmen here who may think they are not getting sufficient credit from the veterans, as their claims for compensation and relief are now being handled by the subdistrict and district offices. But I want to say that since the bureau has been decentralized there have not been half as many complaints, and if you will read the report just issued by Colonel Forbes, you will note that he states that in all the districts where the work has been decentralized the handling of claims has been going on smoothly and efficiently.

That ought to be an answer to the gentleman's statement.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this debate is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi has not talked yet, and the Chair is not able to determine whether the gentleman's remarks are germane or not.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The decentralization of hospitals is not germane.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] is rather late in raising his objection. He waited until the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] had replied to me and put his side of the case before the House. Now to raise objection, it seems to me the gentleman has been guilty of laches.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] may be right in one respect, and that is that there has been a great falling off in the number of applications and the number of claims of veterans that have been filed. But the decentralization bill was passed, I think, on August 7, 1921, more than two and a half years after the war closed. The majority of the men who were suffering disabilities because of the war not only had made prior application, but most of them had been looked after. No wonder there has been a falling off. The logic of the situation is that the longer we go the more the number of these claims should be diminished. To say that they have not been piling up in Congressmen's offices as they have done heretofore is no excuse for spending \$500,000,000 annually when, in my judgment, the work could be done for \$250,000,000 or \$300,000,000 less. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For military and naval insurance, \$90,000,000.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, when the bill for the reorganization of the War Risk Insurance Bureau was passed Congress had provided for three main divisions—the allowance and allotment, the compensation, and the insurance. Later on the question of rehabilitation was taken up and a new measure was introduced to provide for that.

No one, I think, in the House thought that the time would ever come when there would be more money expended for that activity than for any one of the other three. I am sure I had no conception of it whatever. I was very anxious to see this activity undertaken. The allowance and allotment, of course, would not last long after the war ended. The compensation would go on, measured, of course, by the disability. I notice that the bill carries \$118,450,000 for that activity this year; and the insurance feature, which was one of the main items, amounts only to \$90,000,000, as I notice in the bill. But the vocational work this year amounts to \$120,743,000. It is utterly

staggering to me. The first appropriation made was \$2,000,000. The next appropriation was \$4,000,000, and it was increased by amendment on the floor of the House to \$6,000,000. Then I remember it went to \$16,000,000. Now it is \$120,743,000. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations stated that we had reached the peak and that next year, for which we are now making appropriations, it will be a little less than at present, and that the following year it will probably be \$84,000,000.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. FISH. I am afraid the gentleman is giving erroneous information to the House. We have not reached the peak, because these schools heretofore have been unorganized, and hereafter you must provide for teachers, employees, food, and supplies for the trainees, and everything else, and it will be a great deal more than it is in this bill.

Mr. FESS. I will state to the gentleman from New York that I think he is mistaken on that, for the reason that the basis for the rehabilitation is the disability. Will we not reach the point pretty soon where that will be lessened?

Mr. FISH. We have not reached the peak as far as the expense is concerned. The trainees are not in all of these vocational schools yet.

Mr. FESS. I would not want it understood that I am complaining about the work. I am speaking about the enormous size of it. I think it was started without anyone realizing what it was going to amount to. I do not mean to make any apology; but the amount of money required is so large, beyond any thought that I had, that it is somewhat bewildering, and I am concerned about it, whether we will not pretty soon reach the point, if we have not reached it already, where the amount will be very materially lessened and ultimately the rehabilitation work will entirely stop.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. On what date will the privilege of applying for vocational training cease under the law? Is there any limit?

Mr. FESS. There is a limit fixed.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. What is it?

Mr. ROSSDALE. I think it has just been reached.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. December, 1922?

Mr. MADDEN. They can not apply after that, and even if they are certified as eligible they can not take training unless they begin within a year after they are passed on as eligible.

Mr. FESS. I think it would be very unwise for the Congress to launch out into the policy of the Government establishing these schools for rehabilitation, because if you do that I fear it is going to be permanent and that no limit will be placed on the amount of money that will be required.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield once more?

Mr. FESS. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. How many are there who have not yet entered upon their training who have been found eligible?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Ninety-seven thousand.

Mr. MADDEN. There were 107,000 a year ago, and there are 97,000 now. Two hundred and twenty-nine thousand were passed on as eligible, but more than a year has elapsed since many of those were passed on, and they can not receive their training unless they begin within a year after they are found eligible.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Then the maximum number that can go on with vocational training now is how many?

Mr. MADDEN. Ninety-seven thousand.

Mr. BLANTON. I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The gentleman promised me yesterday that he would not bother us at all.

Mr. BLANTON. I am not going to bother you. [Laughter.] Mr. Chairman, I am sure it is a personal pleasure to every Member of this House to have the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. McARTHUR] preside as Chairman of the Committee in the consideration of this bill. In my judgment, first, he is one of the finest parliamentarians we have in the House. [Applause.] Second, he is one of the finest gentlemen we have in this House. [Applause.] Thirdly, he is one of the fairest presiding officers, next to our late lamented Champ Clark, that I ever saw. [Applause.] He is fair to everybody. He is a partisan Republican, and I do not blame him for being partisan. I am a partisan Democrat myself; but no matter how anxious he is to have a quorum here, if to get a record vote, a point of order is made that there is no quorum present and a count lacks one man of having a quorum, he states the honest number regardless of where the chips fly. [Applause.] He ex-

pedites business and is honest and fair, and I for one appreciate a man of that character who sits there and gives every man a fair deal. I am sorry that he is not going to continue next year to preside over the committees of this House. I think the Speaker picked one of the finest men in this House when he chose him to preside over the consideration of this bill which involves \$496,235,000 of the people's money, and I take off my hat to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon. [Applause.]

Mr. ROSSDALE. Mr. Chairman, I happened to come into the Chamber while the discussion was going on about the hospitals of the Veterans' Bureau. I regret I was not here during the general debate on the bill, but in the limited time at my disposal now I will tell the House as briefly as is possible about the hospitalization, or rather lack of hospitalization, by the Veterans' Bureau in the State and in the city of New York.

The number of World War veterans requiring hospitalization is materially reduced by the bureau's usual classification of applicants as "not connected with war service." This classification of a soldier's claim deprives him of hospitalization and also compensation. His claim is thus held up for a considerable period, after which the bureau generally admits the veteran's disability is of service connection.

During this "not connected with war service" period the sick and disabled soldier must shift for himself, oftentimes depending upon charitable or pauper institutions for temporary care and sometimes dying for lack of any care. It is a harsh, cruel trick, but it reduces the number of those receiving hospitalization and enables the bureau to piously exclaim, "See the number of surplus empty beds in our hospitals," when in truth there are thousands of sick and disabled soldiers unlawfully deprived of hospitalization which Congress intended they should have and for which ample appropriation was made.

In the metropolitan district of New York, with its teeming population, there is only one hospital for tuberculosis sufferers, the nearest other such hospital being at Oteen, N. C., neither of which really has enough beds to care for even a portion of those in this district needing same.

In my district we have United States Veterans' Hospital No. 81. It is a neuropsychiatric center. There are 340 patients there, with over 500 employees, an unusually large number of them clerks, and only 8 doctors in the entire place. Millions are being spent, or, rather, misspent, in the handling of the patients there, and the abuse that is heaped upon them has long been a public scandal. The superintendent of that institution lives in a great big house by himself, with numerous servants, a couple of automobiles, chauffeurs on duty day and night, and all the luxuries Uncle Sam's Treasury can afford. It is a house that would provide sufficient beds for a considerable number of sick soldiers. Yet it is used as the private quarters of the superintendent. Patients in that institution refer to it as "the castle of our king." The hospital is located on a 35-acre tract of land. It was to have accommodations for over a thousand patients. It cost to date about three and a half million dollars, with alterations, and presumably will cost more than twice that sum before it will have accommodations for the thousand patients it was intended or claimed to provide for. It might be well for the National Treasury if this House were to investigate the management of that particular Veterans' Bureau hospital. If a congressional investigation was made of Veterans' Bureau hospitalization, I doubt very much that Congress would again give that bureau a blank check, as it has done, to continue its career of waste and inefficiency.

It is more than four years since the armistice was signed, and surely sufficient time has elapsed in which to make hospital provision to do away with the evils of contract hospitals, which in the majority of cases are city, county, or State pauper institutions.

Late in October of last year there were 73 tubercular veteran patients in Sea View Hospital, which is a New York City owned pauper institution. The conditions of the sick veterans there were so intolerably bad that the patients actually had to beg visitors for some food to sustain life, claiming they could not eat the hospital fare.

In response to a signed petition by 67 out of 73 patients there—the other 6 were so bedridden that they could not write—petitioning that they be given decent treatment by the officials in charge, and that they be given food fit for human consumption, and enough to sustain human life; that they be permitted to leave the grounds oftener than only once in 60 days; that they be given clean bed linen; that they be permitted to eat at tables in a dining room, and not be compelled to eat from filthy, rusty iron trays on their beds.

I visited the hospital, where these unfortunate veterans were contracted for by the Veterans' Bureau, and was shocked and grieved to see them existing there in filth and amid revolting conditions.

I called upon Mayor Hylan the next day to complain to him of these conditions. I brought along two ladies, Mrs. Malcolm MacLeod and Mrs. A. P. Dennis, active workers in the Women's Overseas Service League, who had served overseas with our boys during the war and who now devoted their lives to caring for the disabled in hospitals. With these ladies to corroborate my recital of the conditions at Sea View Hospital, I tried to acquaint Mayor Hylan with the facts with the object of remedying them, but the mayor of New York refused to listen and roundly abused both these patriotic women and myself.

I then wrote to the Veterans' Bureau district manager and received this reply, which I will insert in the RECORD, also accounts of the conditions there, printed in the New York Evening Post of October 23 and November 1. The writer of the special Post article is Harold A. Littledale, an experienced and trained investigator. His article tells its own story of shameful abuse and pitiless neglect in this New York City contract hospital:

UNITED STATES VETERANS' BUREAU,
OFFICE OF DISTRICT MANAGER, DISTRICT NO. 2,
New York, N. Y., October 26, 1922.

HON. ALBERT B. ROSSDALE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ROSSDALE: Acknowledgment is made of receipt of your letter dated October 24, 1922, with reference to the conditions now existing at Sea View Hospital.

You are advised that this matter has been taken up by the district office with Commissioner Coler, with a view of correcting the conditions as they now exist at that institution. A further conference will be held with Commissioner Coler, advising him wherein bureau beneficiaries are not receiving the proper attention, and also bring to his attention the fact that the majority of beneficiaries of the bureau now receiving treatment at Sea View are New York City cases. After a reasonable length of time, if it is found that the recommendations as made by the bureau are not put into effect, arrangements will be made to transfer them to Government-owned or controlled hospitals.

For your information it may be added that beneficiaries of this bureau in contract hospitals may always avail themselves of Government hospitalization. There are sufficient beds available for the care of all the tuberculous cases at United States Veterans' Hospital No. 41, New Haven, or United States Veterans' Hospital No. 60, Oteen, N. C., and we will be glad at any time to arrange for the transfer of any of these cases who are able to travel without jeopardizing their lives.

Respectfully,

W. F. LENT,
District Manager, United States
Veterans' Bureau, District No. 2.

[From the New York Evening Post, October 23, 1922.]

REFUSES TO PERMIT ROSSDALE TO TELL OF VETERANS' MISTREATMENT.

An attempt on the part of Representative ALBERT B. ROSSDALE, of the Bronx, to lay before Mayor Hylan matters in connection with his recent investigation of alleged neglect and mismanagement within the veterans' ward of the Sea View Hospital came to an abrupt close today when the mayor; David Hirsfield, commissioner of accounts; and Bird S. Coler, commissioner of public welfare, practically refused Mr. ROSSDALE a hearing.

Mr. ROSSDALE was silenced without being allowed the privilege of completing a single sentence except in defense of his own motives, as were also two women hospital workers who were personally acquainted with conditions at Sea View and who said that they had repeatedly tried to get the attention of the authorities.

DIED WITHOUT MEDICAL AID.

Neither in the remarks of Mr. ROSSDALE nor in the attitude of the two women workers—Mrs. Malcolm MacLeod, of 321 West Fifty-seventh Street, and Mrs. A. P. Dennis, of 34 East Fifty-first Street—was there any apparent trace of bias or political animus. Describing conditions to newspaper men before the hearing, Mrs. MacLeod said that she had been prompted to lay her knowledge of conditions before the mayor by personal observations made especially during the latter part of the summer.

"Men have died in the veterans' ward of Sea View without medical attention," she said. "They have died from undernourishment practically amounting to starvation. During the course of the summer there were no screens in the veterans' ward, and I have known cases where sick men have sat up all during the course of the night brushing the flies and mosquitoes from the faces of their dead comrades. We have repeatedly tried to have these conditions bettered, but have met with nothing but denial."

"Doctor Kramer, the head of the hospital," she continued, "when we brought these facts to his attention, told us that these boys were 'nothing but a lot of truck drivers, who didn't have sense enough to deserve anything better.' I know of one case where a dying man fell out of bed the night he died and was buried with a 2-inch gash on his forehead. I know of another, where a dying man called for the doctor, and died in two hours without medical attention, excepting such as could be administered to him by his comrades."

SEVENTY-THREE TUBERCULAR PATIENTS.

There are 73 tubercular war veterans in the city-owned Sea View Hospital on Staten Island. By arrangement with the Federal Government these patients were transferred there from Fox Hills Hospital when the latter institution was closed after investigations last spring.

Mr. ROSSDALE inspected the veterans' ward yesterday upon receipt of a petition from 67 of the men begging him to bring about their removal. The men complained in particular of filthy and decayed food. In detailing his findings Mr. ROSSDALE said before the hearings took place that he had learned that Albert Johnson, a veteran from his own district in the Bronx, had died of a hemorrhage in the hospital last Friday night 30 minutes before medical aid reached him.

Other discoveries made by Mr. ROSSDALE were that the veterans for whose maintenance the city paid \$3 a day by the Federal Government are allowed but one day leave of absence from the hospital every two months. They are not allowed the privilege of the mess room. Food is dished out to the patients, who must first form in line. They are compelled to take the food back to their beds on dirty trays, he said, and as a result the cots and bedding have be-

come foul and greasy. The kitchen he found dirty and fly ridden, and the food not only insufficient but in some cases insanitary.

The "hearing" took place in a little antechamber to the mayor's office. When Congressman ROSSDALE, together with Mrs. MacLeod and Mrs. Dennis, was admitted, the mayor was seated at a small desk in the center of the room. On either side of him were Mr. Hirschfeld and Mr. Coler, both of whom had spent some time in conference with the mayor before the hearing. Mr. ROSSDALE walked in with four rusty trays he brought up from the hospital as examples of the eating conditions there and was immediately confronted by the hostile glares of the mayor and his two commissioners.

HYLAN TRIED INTERRUPTION.

"Mr. Mayor," Congressman ROSSDALE began, "I am here in behalf of the veterans in Sea View Hospital. I have investigated conditions there and have a report to make."

The mayor started to interrupt, but Mr. ROSSDALE broke him off, laying the four trays down on the table.

"I wouldn't let a dog eat out of these things," he burst out. "And yet these filthy, rusty things serve as tables for tubercular patients who have suffered in the World War."

"Just a minute, just a minute," shouted the mayor. "We want to get to the bottom of this thing. You are running for reelection, I believe."

"We won't bring politics into this thing, Mr. Mayor," Congressman ROSSDALE said. "I am here to speak on things I have seen and which you can remedy. One of the boys in my district died last Friday night in Sea View under conditions that were utterly intolerable. I am here to speak for him and for more who may die in the near future."

The mayor flushed angrily.

"What time did that man die?" snapped out Mr. Coler.

"Some time during the course of the late afternoon," Mr. ROSSDALE began. "He was unable to get medical assistance. I want to tell you, too, about the sanitary conditions. The food is bad. These trays are typical of the way it is served. They are dirty and rusty. The beds are rusty. Would you let a dog eat out of a thing like that?" he added, pointing at the tray.

[From the New York Evening Post, November 1, 1922.]

DISMISS VETERANS WHO COMPLAIN AT SEA VIEW HOSPITAL—CITY AUTHORITIES OPENLY DECLARE THEY DO NOT WANT MEN THERE—EX-SOLDIER PATIENTS SAY THEY WERE SERVED WITH WORMY CEREALS AND OTHER UNFIT FOOD.

(By Harold A. Littledale.)

War veterans who complained against conditions at Sea View Hospital on Staten Island now charge that those who had the courage to speak out openly have been summarily dismissed and have had to leave the hospital.

The fact of the matter is that Dr. Geza Kremer, medical superintendent, does not want the soldiers at Sea View. He has said so openly. He has been in the employ of the city for 26 years. He was graduated from the College of Physicians and Surgeons in 1894, and when he applied for admission there he gave his home address as "Austria" and said he was a graduate of the Catholic Gymnasium of Budapest.

While Doctor Kremer and Bird S. Coler, commissioner of public welfare, must take responsibility for conditions at Sea View and should ask for a real investigation, the Veterans' Bureau and Congress must be blamed for the fact that these men, disabled in the service of their country, suffering with tuberculosis—all of them—have been farmed out on contracts, and then have not been properly supervised.

For the farming out Congress is to blame. Four years after the armistice enough Government hospitals do not exist. In this State, for instance, which provided one-tenth of all the men in the military service, there is not a single Government hospital for the treatment of tuberculosis. That, of course, is scandalous.

COSTS \$100,000 A YEAR.

Under such circumstances the men had to be farmed out. They are being farmed out at Sea View for \$3 a day. That is what the Veterans' Bureau is paying for them; and as there are about 90 soldiers there now, the bill, in rough figures, comes to approximately \$100,000 a year.

Yet, although the Veterans' Bureau is spending that amount, it has been callously indifferent as to the service rendered. For the bureau has not been in ignorance of conditions at Sea View. Months ago formal complaint was lodged with the district officer here, but nothing was done. A few weeks ago formal complaint was lodged with the central office of the bureau in Washington, but nothing was done. And since the outcry only a perfunctory inspection has been made.

But what has the Veterans' Bureau been getting for its investment of \$100,000 a year? Well, the boys charge that they have been getting wormy cereal, stale and even rotten eggs, unfit meat, and unwashed vegetables. Do you expect tuberculous men to get well on that? Why, the situation became so bad that men were actually bringing their food to the office of the Evening Post and writing so many letters of complaint that an investigation was decided on. That investigation was begun some days before Representative ALBERT B. ROSSDALE visited the hospital, and this article is the third of a series on Sea View occasioned by the investigation.

Closing Fox Hills Hospital in April necessitated sending its patients to other hospitals. Some went to hospitals nearer their homes, but veterans of New York wanted, and rightfully so, to be placed in hospitals here where they could be visited by their relatives. But the hospitals did not exist—at least the Government hospitals did not exist—back there last April any more than they do this November. There was room at Sea View, which is operated by the department of public welfare, and although Kremer did not want the veterans, Coler made the contract and the veterans came.

Kremer at that time was quite open about not wanting the soldiers. He was quite open about the fact that they would be treated no better than the city patients. That would be all right if the city patients were well treated and had no complaint, but the facts of how they are treated were told in last night's Evening Post.

WHEN VETERANS COMPLAINED.

Doctor Kremer fulfilled his threat. At first the veterans were treated just the same as the city patients. Complaint resulted. Any one with vision would have seen that complaint would result. The result was that the veterans were given some extras at meals and, as they are complaining now, you can imagine how the city patients would protest if they only dared.

When the transfer was made from Fox Hills to Sea View the Women's Overseas Service League asked permission to visit the veterans. It was at first refused. Coler would not hear of it and

Kremer would not hear of it, although Sea View is supposed to be a public hospital. Not until the women agreed in writing that they would "cooperate" were they allowed to visit the veterans. And that "cooperation," stripped to its bare form, was a promise not to let their eyes see conditions, and if they did see never to speak of them. But if Sea View is well run, if it is a good hospital, why is that necessary? The well-run hospital, the hospital with nothing to hide, would want everything seen and its praises sung from the housetops, surely. And since they have been going there the members of the Women's Overseas Service League have taken about 100 dozen eggs each month, among other things. If the food at Sea View is good, why is that necessary?

"The cereal was often wormy," the soldiers explained. "The food was poorly cooked and served cold as a rule. There was seldom enough, and fish was invariably bad. At times the fish was positively rotten; the eggs were black, and the bread was dry and not well baked. Almost invariably the vegetables were unwashed. Sometimes we found worms in the cabbage—say, look here."

The man dipped his spoon in his soup and fished out a fly.

VETERANS THROWN OUT.

Since the complaints at Sea View became known the hospital authorities have been dismissing all who were prepared to tell the truth. Three of the first to go were dismissed when matters were in a ferment, two days before the publicity began. They were W. J. Sheridan, George B. Schafer, and George Rue. They went out to eat when all they got for breakfast was cold toast and cold coffee. Upon their return they were thrown out. There is no other word for it. And within a day or so they were followed by Orle Palmer and John Hogan, both of whom were dismissed on some silly fiction, but actually to get them out of the road of investigators who were certain to come.

It was on Monday, October 23, that Congressman ROSSDALE complained to the mayor. On Wednesday last, two days later, Commissioner Coler went to the hospital. As he went up the elevator orderlies ran down the stairs with the rusty trays. Thus was the denial of rusty trays made good. They were not there when Coler came. They had been replaced with white ones. The writer saw the substitution made, and if Coler did not see it, too, he must have been very unobservant that day.

Complaint of lack of medical attention has brought about a change. There is no lack of doctors just now. You run into them in every ward. But, of course, tubercular patients do not need much medication. It is only when a hemorrhage occurs or something like that happens that a doctor is needed. And then he is needed quickly. First measures can be taken by a nurse, to be sure, but a doctor should come. The veterans say that hours often pass before the doctor does arrive. And that, of course, is wrong.

DOCTOR CAME TOO LATE.

In the case of Albert Johnson, who died the other day, the veterans say that although the doctor was sent for at 4 o'clock he did not arrive until after the boy was dead. And on top of that they charge that the body of this dead soldier was wheeled out into the hall of the ward and left there, some screens about it that did not more than half conceal the still and lifeless form. For nearly three hours it was left there. The veterans say it was not moved till nearly 7. They fix the time because they say the orderly "hoped" the men from the morgue would come before he got off at 7. And they came a few minutes before he did get off.

That conditions have been allowed to come to this stage is due to the failure of the Veterans' Bureau properly to supervise its contract. It went into that contract knowing that Kremer would stand for no suggestions. It placed a liaison officer there for a few weeks, but he is gone. It had a vocational adviser there for a few weeks, but he is gone. It had a compensation man there for a few weeks, but he is gone. Nothing has been done in a definite, permanent way. The Veterans' Bureau has left things drift, and now they have reached this pass.

On top of that there is no Government hospital in this State where these boys can go. For that Congress is to blame. The hospital program was delayed. Hospitals are now being begun that should have been begun as quickly after the armistice as the money could be appropriated. And to add to the delay, General Sawyer has been saying that there are Government beds aplenty. But if there are Government beds aplenty, why are men in contract hospitals? And nearly 10,000 disabled soldiers are in contract hospitals. That in itself shows that General Sawyer's contention is but a silly fiction.

If the veterans are to stay at Sea View, control over them should pass into the hands of the Veterans' Bureau. It should have its own doctors there, and, while they would observe the hospital rules, they should be left as free as possible and with power to see that the food is fresh and fit and clean and well cooked. Then when the new hospitals are built the boys should be moved away. Doctor Kremer has had his chance and appears to have failed.

When I appealed to the Veterans' Bureau for relief for those men who are suffering from tuberculosis, the Veterans' Bureau admitted that they had no beds in the metropolitan district, and that if I wanted to get them transferred, the nearest place was Oteen, N. C., or New Haven, Conn. Now, gentlemen of this House, many of these boys were near death. They wanted to be near their relatives, and there ought to be some hospital where they could have been hospitalized near the city of New York and not down in North Carolina, Connecticut, or elsewhere. Why has not the Veterans' Bureau so arranged its hospitalization that these men could be taken care of in a Government hospital equipped to care for tubercular patients somewhere near the great city of New York?

Mr. MADDEN. They are building a very large hospital in New York now.

Mr. ROSSDALE. They abandoned that after they started it.

Mr. MADDEN. No; they are building one. They have just bought an orphan asylum down there and are rebuilding it.

Mr. ROSSDALE. The former orphan asylum is the one I have referred to. That was completed more than a year ago and is known as United States hospital No. 81. That is a building that is limited to mental-hygiene cases; it is an immense, big place, and ought to be sufficiently large to house more than a

thousand patients. It was the former Roman Catholic orphan asylum, and it then housed over 800 children. Now there is room there for only 340 patients, because the official who has charge of that institution does not want to be burdened with too many patients and because Director Forbes, of the Veterans' Bureau at Washington, permits him to run the place like an overseas hospital camp in 1918 during hostilities.

This hospital is not for tubercular patients and none are there, for they are all in contract hospitals in the metropolitan district. While we are crying about the shortage of beds the bureau is lying about a surplus of them. Congress ought to look into that situation; and when we are appropriating all of this money you gentlemen might consider how little you are doing for these soldier boys in New York and, for that matter, for those elsewhere in the United States of America.

They have not had and have not proper hospitalization now, and it is useless to appeal to the Veterans' Bureau. I have appealed time and time again and have received nothing but evasion. Almost every Member of Congress has received the same treatment. Back home we are held responsible for the Veterans' Bureau. Although the faults are administrative, we are nevertheless held accountable by our constituencies.

I was informed that the bureau purchased a site for a tuberculosis hospital in the highlands back of the Hudson River, and after a fortune was spent in blasting rock and digging out soil for a foundation the bureau suddenly ordered a cessation of work and abandonment of the project, declaring the site to be unsuitable. Just why the bureau did not study and know the site conditions before buying the land and contracting for the erection of the buildings is a mystery that perhaps Director Forbes can solve. It would be interesting to know the why and wherefore of this unusual and costly proceeding.

It is a sad commentary upon our boasted care and tender solicitude for those who made such great sacrifices in the World War. Our sins of omission and commission will not be explained away with the blame placed upon this particular administrative bureau, but, rather, upon the Government, that is directly responsible for this branch of itself.

Congress, if it would so desire, could reform the Veterans' Bureau and render a great service to the Nation. If ever there was a part of the Government that needed the flood light of publicity turned upon it, it is this petted darling of the administration, which defies public opinion and public decency and is getting away with it.

It is useless to appeal to the President, for have not the American Legion and other veteran organizations' pleas for more and better hospitalization been rejected? I have often wondered what was the magic possessed by Director Forbes that enabled him to continue in favor at the White House, when all the country has long been aware of Forbes's incompetency.

I base my opinion that it is useless to appeal to the President of the United States because I have appealed to him from a harsh ruling of Director Forbes and found it was useless. Evidently Forbes, right or wrong, must be upheld.

About a year ago I called upon President Harding and personally appealed to him to set aside an unusually harsh and cruel ruling of Forbes in the case of a soldier boy from my district who went to Arizona in a last effort to stay alive in the healthful climate of that locality.

This boy was in the last stages of tuberculosis. The bureau ordered him to leave the private sanatorium where he was at Prescott and to enter Whipple Barracks Hospital, but he was too far gone to be able to obey the order without risking the likelihood of his removal resulting in death. He pleaded to be permitted to remain where he was for the little while left for him to live, but a Forbes ruling, like a law of ancient Media, was immutable. The bureau stopped his compensation because he was too weak to leave the bed where he lay sick unto death.

I begged, pleaded, argued, and threatened for the boy, but was coldly rebuked by Veterans' Bureau officials. Incensed at the bureau's heartlessness I appealed to President Harding in person, but without avail. The poor soldier was never able to leave the bed where he lay and died some months later. Veterans' Bureau officials later refused to allow even funeral expenses for this dead soldier, because, forsooth, he died without being able to comply with a stupid, arbitrary, and unwarranted Forbes rule.

If the files of that bureau possessed the power of speech, what terrible stories of mismanagement, inhumanity, and stupidity they would tell. Some day, but perhaps too late, much of it will be made known. For my own self I will say to this House that I have no confidence in the management of the Veterans' Bureau to vote any more lump-sum appropriations to it and will vote against this bill for this reason. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ROSSDALE. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the privilege granted to me by the House to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the Veterans' Bureau, I am inserting the story of the investigation into the rehabilitation and hospitalization of our World War veterans in the New York metropolitan district.

The series of articles comprising this story was written by an able and trained investigator, M. J. Racusin, a New York Tribune special writer, and published in that newspaper. I am conversant with all of the subject matter therein and know the facts to be true as stated. I believe the country will want to know these facts, and for that reason I am inserting them in the RECORD.

It is a graphic portrayal of the colossal failure of the Veterans' Bureau to properly function, and proves what critics of the bureau, including myself, have contended for months, that only a congressional investigation will check the costly "muddling through" policies of the bureau.

The question of rehabilitation and hospitalization of our World War veterans is a great problem. I am firmly convinced it requires the best brains and genius we have to solve it.

It is incumbent upon the administration to enlist our ablest men for this task, for the results shown in the following story prove that it has been intrusted too long to men of mediocre ability who are unable to cope with it.

[From the New York Tribune.]

WAR CRIPPLES LEARN LITTLE IN "TRAINING"—VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS FOR NEW YORK SOLDIERS CALLED FAILURE AS MEN ARE MISHANDLED AND NEGLECTED—VICTIMS WITH BAD FEET PEDAL MACHINES—SHUNTED ABOUT DESPITE PROTESTS—NO JUDGMENT USED, VETERANS SAY.

(By M. Jay Racusin.)

What is happening to New York's soldiers disabled in the World War?

Three years ago the crippled veterans were placed in schools and workshops in an effort to restore them to usefulness. The Government has been spending millions to help them get another clutch on life.

The crisis for many of these men is at hand. In a few short months their periods of training will have expired.

Have they been rehabilitated?

Have they learned profitable trades?

Will they have jobs awaiting them?

It is in an attempt to answer these questions that these articles are written. The investigation upon which they are based shows—

That 75 out of every 100 of the veterans sent through the training schools have been pitifully neglected;

That they have been inadequately trained or scarcely trained;

That at the expiration of their periods of instruction they will meet almost insurmountable barriers to profitable employment;

That if present conditions continue they will find few if any jobs awaiting them;

That they will find themselves almost as helpless as they were four years ago.

SERIOUSNESS IS RECOGNIZED, PLANS FOR RELIEF STARTED.

There are indications that the seriousness of the situation is at least being recognized and plans are on foot to meet it, how successfully remains to be seen. The continual change of district chiefs here—eight in 14 months—is declared to be chiefly responsible for the development of these chaotic conditions. The present manager, Maj. W. F. Lent, has been in office only five months, and can hardly be held accountable for their existence.

On the contrary, it is asserted by those who have the welfare of the veteran at heart that he is the first man who has shown an understanding of the soldier's troubles and is taking vigorous measures to correct them. If at this time there is to be a ninth manager, it would be all but calamitous for the disabled soldiers.

Those who have gone through the relentless war sieve of the days of 1917 know how careful the Government was to select only perfect specimens for its armies. Many came back shattered. Then, apparently, a miracle took place. For now the Government tells the blinded veteran that he will make an excellent tailor; the poor fellow with smashed feet is told they are fine for pedaling a sewing machine; a soldier with paralyzed hands is told he can be a skillful sign painter; a veteran with a battered right arm is advised to wield heavy tools as a mechanic; an ex-service man suffering from tuberculosis is set to confining battery making; a disabled fighter who has had three years' instruction under Government supervision as an auto mechanic is offered a job as a "butterfly" in a theatrical entertainment at the conclusion of his training.

\$430,000,000 SPENT YEARLY TO RESTORE MAIMED VETERANS.

This is illustrative, in a few words, of how a large proportion of the maimed veterans have been handled in accordance with the Government's promise to nurse them back to health and restore them to gainful occupations, at an expenditure which this year totals \$430,000,000.

There are 97,859 veterans undergoing "training" for one or another of 170 and odd trades and professions in institutions of learning and workshops throughout the Nation. Of these 11,763 are receiving instruction in district No. 2, including New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, with headquarters here. About 8,000 of these men are in and of the metropolitan area, and half of them are in schools, with the other half distributed through shops of various trades for supposedly practical experience.

Under the law the injured ex-service men are permitted training in some profitable occupation, the period of instruction not to exceed four years. During this time the Government is responsible financially for the man's tuition, and in addition allows him generally from \$100 to \$145 a month for support.

At the end of the four-year period, however, the Government virtually discharges him. If he has learned something and jobs are plentiful and his physical disability is not too great, well and good.

But if he hasn't learned a trade, and countless barriers are put in his way, what is he to do?

On July 1 and during the several months following the allotted four-year period of training will expire for about 2,000 of them. Many are married and have families. A large number of them face a desperate situation.

It is generally agreed among those interested in the welfare of the disabled veteran that the medical and hospital facilities provided and planned for his care and treatment are fairly satisfactory, although there is still room for much improvement.

As for training and rehabilitation, however, I can say from personal observation that the matter would be laughable if it were not pitiful. This is true of a large percentage of the cases. I make this assertion on the basis of a four weeks' trip through representative places of instruction, conversations with teachers and Government agents, and talks with scores of the shattered veterans themselves.

Here are some of the most striking facts that have come under my observation:

Hundreds of ex-service men are being crowded through the private institutions that grew up over night, with little facilities and less soul, and whose only interest, on the word of the veterans themselves, appears to be the collection of the contract price allowed by the Government.

One of the institutions at which instruction is given is actually owned by a salaried official of the United States Veterans' Bureau, employed at the bureau's Washington headquarters.

TRAINING AT TIMES IS NO MORE THAN HOLLOW GESTURE.

The training offered in a goodly portion of these schools is nothing more than a hollow gesture, the men idling away their allotted four years of instruction loitering about unworkable or insufficient machinery, with few instructors about, and these incompetent and little interested in the trainees. In the best of these places, I was informed by a Government agent, fewer than 30 out of every 100 trainees could ever hope to be turned out even mediocre craftsmen.

Here were war derelicts whose physical disabilities made it obvious that they could never succeed at the vocations assigned to them by the advisers in the Veterans' Bureau. There were bent and useless hands set at sign painting. There were helpless feet ordered to turn fur-working machines. There were clouded eyes "advised" to read micrometers, and grammar-school mentalities assigned to vocations requiring a knowledge of geometry and trigonometry.

Here are men, too, who dislike the trade foisted upon them, who take no interest in learning its rudiments, who do not intend to work at it at the conclusion of their training period, who have repeatedly appealed for transfer to some other industry, but who are still there after months and years of lost time.

Then there are those who throw up their hands in despair and say: "What's the use of the whole business, anyhow? We are in overcrowded industries. And then the labor unions won't admit us into their ranks. They have told us this years ago. They insist that we serve long periods of apprenticeship, come into the industries as new men and make worthless the four years' training we have received from the Government. That means there will be open only to us a few low-paying nonunion jobs. Well, the flag waving is over and there is no more hurrahing, so there you are."

DO OUTSIDE WORK BUT GET NOTHING FOR IT.

"Why, we even do outside work for the head of the school. He sells our stuff and pockets the money. Don't you call this exploitation? What are you going to do?"

A close-up view of one of the institutions in which instruction is offered will give an insight into the causes of the situation and suggest probable remedies.

The Fur and Leather School, at 153 West Thirteenth Street, is the place owned by an official at the Washington office of the United States Veterans' Bureau. He is Herbert Blair, a "training officer" in the rehabilitation division of the bureau, at present touring New York and Boston, inspecting and studying trade-training institutions. His salary is about \$3,000 a year, and according to Personnel Chief Longfellow, he has been on and off the bureau pay rolls since 1918.

Records show that Blair was employed at the New York office of the Veterans' Bureau in 1918 at a salary of \$4,000 a year as vocational officer. For a short time thereafter his pay was reduced to \$2,500, and on July 1, 1920, he became a \$1 a year man as a counselor. He had a short leave of absence with pay from November 17, 1919, to December 31, 1919, apparently to give him time to organize his school. He had another leave—this time without pay—between January 1, 1920, and June 30 of the same year.

On November 14, 1922, he was appointed a "training officer" by the Washington headquarters, which position he now holds. He is at this moment stationed at 563 Massachusetts Avenue, Boston.

GETS ADDITIONAL PAY FOR TRAINING OF SOLDIERS.

Blair, while a vocational officer in the bureau, opened his fur and leather school in Thirteenth Street in November, 1919. It is in operation at this writing. His contract with the Government calls for the payment to him of \$50 per trainee per month for the first six months of instruction and \$25 per trainee per month for the next six months. The school supplies its own materials.

I am told there were never less than 35 to 40 students in the place since its inception, so that its director has been receiving the tidy sum of about \$20,000 a year, in addition to his compensation as a Government official.

The institution is an old two-story brick affair, which the men call a fire trap. Upon my visit a week ago there were only two instructors, one for the leather workers and one for the fur workers. The man in charge was Irving W. Foltz, who later told me that he was merely acting for Mr. Blair; that the latter was the director. Foltz also said that Blair "was connected with the Government and that he was investigating the Veterans' Bureau for the Veterans' Bureau." There were 34 men in the school at the time.

What goes on there? Here is Genaro Deputso, of 107 Ditmas Avenue, Brooklyn. He has bad feet. They were frozen overseas and they are now unmanageable and painful.

"I've been here four months in this fur school," he says, "and I only had two little bits of work to do. Eh, it's a rotten place, and why did they put me here? Look at my feet. The machines, you know, upstairs, which sew the pieces of fur together, are worked with the feet. What can I do? But they think it's all right. There are a lot of fellows upstairs in my position. They have been trying to get changed to other work, but nothing doing."

"What are they going to do with us, anyhow? Even if I had feet to work with, it wouldn't do no good. Furs! Huh, it's funny! There's a

few rabbit skins been lying around which the men have been tearing apart and sewing together, tearing apart and sewing together, day in and day out, for weeks and months, and that's all we get to know about the fur business."

"Oh, yes; a few months ago they did bring some coats of some kind to work on. It was an outside job, and the fellows who had been there for a long time couldn't even tell what kind of a fur it was. Well, anyhow, there was some fussing around with them, and whatever work was done on them the school people must have got the money for."

"And, then, what good is it anyhow? The season for fur workers only lasts for 3 or 4 months of the year, and if a man sticks in the trade for 20 years, maybe he can make \$50 a week. But we ain't taught the fur business! We couldn't make \$10 a week even 3 months a year."

"Would you believe it, an adviser at the Veterans' Bureau put me first in auto mechanics, and with my punk legs, mind you. Then it sort of struck somebody funny, and they put me in mechanical optics. I spent months and months in both trades and learned nothing—nothing. Then I came here. They saw my legs, and they knew what I had to do in furs, but they sent me here just the same."

"My period of training is supposed to be over this coming September. I don't know any trade and I don't know what is going to happen to me. I heard they were going to put me at shoemaking for awhile. But I was a first-class barber before the war. Do you think I will take such a thing as a shoemaker?"

Let G—E—, who feared the use of his name might involve him in some difficulty, cast a little more light on the institution. E—lives in Brooklyn. His feet have been operated upon so frequently, he said, that he has lost count of the number of times. He can scarcely stand up with the aid of an oaken stick.

SAYS BUREAU JUST WANTS TO GET MEN OFF THEIR HANDS.

"Yes, I'm in the fur school, too," he volunteered. "Bad feet? Well, I guess that don't make any difference to the bureau. They just want to get you off their hands. How can I touch a machine with my feet? I don't touch them, and I'm not getting anywhere. I'd be satisfied if they got me a news stand some place, just the place, you know. Sure, they must know I can't work a fur machine with these feet. I've been here nearly a year, I guess, and I certainly don't know what it's all about yet. My period is going to be over soon. I guess I'll land in a hospital."

"This fur school is a dumping ground, anyhow. When an adviser or training officer has to think a little about what he is going to do with you he thinks of shoemaking, tailoring, and then fur making. That's a fact. Go upstairs yourself and see how many men with bad feet are supposed to be working fur machines. Besides, some of the fellows got bad eyes. How they ever expect to learn anything in the fur trade I don't know. They're all disgusted with it and say the place ought to be closed up. On the level, Jack, it's next door to nothing."

"It's just as bad in the leather room. The fellows just got through working on an outside job, but the fellows got no money. And it wasn't such fancy work, either. They just did a little clipping on a bunch of pocketbooks. That's about as much as they learn in the leather room. Hasn't anything ever been said about this school before? Why, the fellows knew it all along."

"But you know how it is. A lot of the men are helpless, many of them are married and have children like me, and they depend on that \$100 a month for support, and they're afraid if they kick they will be thrown out of training altogether and their support stopped. It's happened lots of times."

ONLY 5 PER CENT WILL BE ABLE TO GET JOB IN TRADE.

"Now, take those 30 men in this school. I know for a fact that not more than 5, or 10 at the most, will ever be able to get a job worth talking about in these trades. In the first place, a lot of the men can't do the work because of their injuries. In the second place, they aren't taught the trade in any way; and, in the third place, the unions are hard and won't let the men in, and you know what kind of a stiff union the fur workers have. And one of the great troubles is that Government advisers never tell us about this union stonewall we are going to run up against in this industry. That's a little surprise they hold out on us. What are we going to do? I don't know."

I approached another of the men named C—

"Are you really learning anything about the fur trade?" I asked.

"Only what my eyes can teach me," he replied. "You can see for yourself what I can do with these pretty feet. And besides it's rabbit skins, rabbit skins. Who says anything about fur?"

"But you are supposed to get instruction in combing, curing, and all the other processes involved in preparing furs for the market. The Government, I think, is paying the school \$50 every month for each of you fellows on the ground that the materials you work with cost so much," I remarked.

"Supposed, supposed, that's another thing you want to be careful of. I was supposed to be a dental mechanic, but just like that, they turned me into a fur worker. You know, everybody starts as a dental mechanic. God, if they all turned out dental mechanics who started in it we'd have more people making molars than there are false teeth in the United States! That's no joke. There's Eppy. Ask Eppy. He's been through it."

And so the stories here ran. A few of the men told me that they really wanted to learn the trade, that they had families to provide for, and that they realized they had to find a way to earn their bread and butter at the expiration of their training period.

The usual complaint, however, was that they had been repeatedly misadvised as to the type of vocational training they were to or could pursue; that they had been shifted thoughtlessly from one trade to another, and then after wasting, literally, years were finally dumped into this and other work places despite their obvious inability to work in these industries.

"There used to be two men here teaching English to the boys who couldn't understand what was going on," broke in Deputso in the course of a discussion. "Maybe they got wise that we were learning something. They don't even give us this now. At least some of the men with bad feet could pick up something with their ears. But the teachers have gone away and we haven't had the course in two or three months."

"Do you think you can do anything for us?" Deputso finally pleaded. "You know. You are real fellows. We don't want charity, but we want to be able to turn a nickel for ourselves, and hold our heads right when we are turned loose. It's coming soon. See what you can do."

BROKEN WAR VETERANS BEG FOR JUSTICE—MEN WITH BATTERED BACKS, BRACED ARMS, STIFFENED FINGERS SENT TO SCHOOL TO LEARN MECHANICS—TEACHER GETS \$40 MONTH A STUDENT—MERE YOUTH, CALLED "BUSY KID," IN CHARGE—ONLY THREE LATHES FOR 80 TO OPERATE.

"Gad, it's a mighty twinge the old leg gives me every now and then. The Boche bullet sure did muss up this right foot of mine. I can hardly stand up more than two or three minutes at a time. Huh! It's funny. Here I am with a punk leg and my lungs on the blink, and I ought to be outdoors on some light kind of work or something, and they're trying to make an expert mechanic out of me, just like that."

Richard Grogan was telling me of his troubles and those of his veteran associates at the Holmes Vocational School, 649 Broadway, where the Government has placed 80 disabled soldiers for training in mechanics and sheet-metal work. The institution occupies the fifth floor of a loft building, and is headed by Lawrence Holmes, a mere youth in appearance, who is referred to by the trainees as "the busy kid" from his generally hurried manner.

MICAWHER AIR IN SCHOOL.

The school has a Micawber air about it, the men standing leisurely about as though expecting something. They had a queer way of greeting each other with, "Anybody hurt? Anybody hurt?" interspersed with the question, "Did it come? Did it come?" the significance of which I learned a little later.

Holmes opened his place in July, 1921, his contract with the Government providing that he be paid \$40 a month for each man sent to the school by the Veterans' Bureau for training. A large section of the school floor is taken up with an elaborately furnished office, with comptometers, cash registers, and other devices for keeping record of apparently flourishing incoming and outgoing accounts.

Behind the office were a few miniature so-called classrooms and then came the training shop. There were a couple of rows of machines and two belts were working. The students were just standing idly about in their hats, white collars, and coats.

NOT LEARNING A THING.

"The place is a circus," Grogan began to tell me, "and when it's not a circus it's just a hang out. We're not learning a thing. How can we? Look at me, for instance. I've been here a year and a half. My foot is bunged up and my lungs were gassed. I ought to be out doors, but they keep me here. I've asked to be transferred a thousand times. I'll never be a mechanic. The work is too hard; that is, when you're learning real mechanics. But the advisor at the Veterans' Bureau says, 'You be a mechanic,' and here I am. It's a waste of time. I don't know what I'm going to do. I haven't learned anything, and the period of my training is nearly over, and in a few months they're going to turn me loose as an expert mechanic. But there are a lot of fellows here in my boots."

Here he pointed out a score of men who had one bodily disability or another which it was obvious precluded every possibility of their ever being able to succeed in the trade in which they were expected in a short time to earn a livelihood. There was one with a braced arm with which it was evident he certainly could not handle tools. Another had stiffened fingers, another a battered back, and so on. I counted 15 of these unfortunates.

"How did these fellows ever come to this place?" I asked Grogan. "Why are they permitted to remain here?"

ORDERED TO BE MECHANIC.

"The fellows ask themselves that question in their sleep," Grogan replied. "In the first place, the advisor or training officer at the Veterans' Bureau headquarters simply ordered them to come here and said, 'You'll be a mechanic.' The soldier shows his broken hand and says, 'What, with this hand?' but the advisor says, 'You'll be a mechanic or nothing.'"

"Well, you know a lot of these fellows are married and have children and are helpless and need the \$100 or \$135 a month that the Government gives us while we are in training. And that's the answer why a lot of us are here. Of course, we want to learn something. We'd like to learn some kind of trade, but we're not miracle workers."

"Let me tell you, the people that sent us here have either ivory heads or shrewd ones. But it certainly is tough on us. It's wrecking a lot of lives. Something ought to be done about it. What am I going to do? I don't know. We'll turn out a fine bunch of panhandlers. There's at least 15 fellows in here that's got bum arms or hands or something and never will turn a wheel or handle a hammer. Then there are about 15 more who never wanted to be mechanics, who don't take any interest in it, aren't learning anything about it, and are just wasting their time here."

PLEADS TO BE TAKEN AWAY.

"These fellows," continued Grogan, "have pleaded and pleaded to be taken away from here and transferred to something they can do. We've got grievance committees up and done a lot of talking, but the training officer says the matter is being considered and things like that, and months go by and years, and we're here."

"But isn't the head of the school or the instructor supposed to recommend your transfer from here when he finds a veteran is not making any progress or can't perform the duties of the trade?" I asked.

"Yes, he's supposed to, but I guess they have reasons for wanting to keep us here. The head of the school gets \$40 a man a month from the Government, and he certainly should like to keep as many men here as he can. Don't you see the point? But the Government inspectors oughtn't to let anything like this go on. It's human lives and careers they are dealing with. For God's sake, we managed to come out of the war alive. Now, well, it's no use kicking, but if they are trying to do something for us this dump ought to be put out of business."

With the help of Grogan and a few trainees I took stock of the place. There were only four engine lathes available for the entire student body. There were three Miller machines, but only one doing accurate work. The bench lathes could be used for only the most elementary work.

NOT ENOUGH MACHINES.

"Why, I haven't been on an engine lathe since last August. There isn't enough machines for half the men," insisted Grogan. "Here, ask Loccari, there, what the instructor told him when he complained he couldn't get a machine."

Loccari told me he hadn't been near a machine for three months. Once, he said, he became desperate and thought he ought to know just a little bit and demanded he be given a machine. "Why, grab one, grab one!" he said the instructor told him. "Why, the fellows sleep here all night so they'll have the machines in the morning."

"Can you beat it?" broke in Grogan. "They tell use to fight for the machines. Well, we have a little joke about it, and that's what the fellows mean when you hear them say, 'Anybody hurt? Anybody hurt?'"

Six months ago the veterans were told new machines were on the way "any day." "Any day" has never come, and that's the source of another little joke of theirs, the "Did they come?" question which they use with guffaws on all occasions.

LESSONS IN ENGLISH.

I was informed that the instructors in the place are hard put to it to occupy the idle time of the trainees, and take up all of Wednesday and Thursday in the miniature classrooms, seating possibly 15 men, with lessons in English, drawing, geometry, trigonometry, logarithms, and mathematics.

"But that's another funny thing," broke in Grogan, in reply to a question, "there isn't 3 fellows in the whole school of 80 who knows anything about those things, and you know that they are important in tool and die making. Of course, these men aren't prepared for it, yet an adviser thought it was all right, and the teachers just go through it like a machine. Nobody gets anything—and there you are."

Grogan called over a number of his associates to testify that there were only two instructors actually available for machine-shop instruction, and that these did little to help the trainees learn even the most elementary things. There were two instructors used in classroom work, they explained, and the best machine-shop man was used for the personal service of Holmes himself.

USE THEIR OWN JUDGMENT.

"And in drawing," one of the veterans broke in, "they just tell you to use your own judgment. We come here to learn, mind you, and they tell us to use our own judgment. Here's Wiener. He'll tell you a thing or two."

Joseph Wiener has been in the school since March 1, 1922, having come from a defunct institution called Lincoln Institute, where several hundred veterans lost two years of valuable time learning nothing.

"I've been here nearly a year now," said Wiener, "and they told me I would be turned loose as an expert machinist in November of 1923. Ha, it's funnier than a joke! Why, I don't know any more about mechanics than when I first came here, and it isn't my fault, either. I know I won't be able to earn \$10 a week at the trade. They didn't tell us anything about the union business, either. You know the union won't take us trainees in because they say we don't get any instruction. The whole thing is a rotten, botched-up affair, and we men are the sufferers."

EYES AND LUNGS AFFECTED.

Wiener has a wife and child. He was a polisher before the war. His eyes are bad, and his lungs have been affected by his war service. "Why, I can't even see a micrometer, you know, to measure things with, and yet they think I'll make a mechanic. I've asked to be transferred, but that's as far as it goes. I'm not the only one. Why, a dozen fellows in this place can't do the work. There are men with tuberculosis in here. Why do they keep fellows like us, who will never be mechanics, here? It ain't fair. We ought to get an even break."

Wiener expressed the opinion that not 30 out of the entire 80 students in the school are learning even the most elementary things about mechanics because of the lack of facilities or the physical inability of the men to continue with the trade.

Another thing that interfered with the training of the men here, I was told, was the custom of the school authorities of bringing outside work into the institution and importing expert mechanics to do the job on the machines that should be used solely for the instruction of the trainees.

NOT AVAILABLE FOR STUDENTS.

I was told of two such contracts, the last of which was for the construction of some radio outfits, which, I was told, occupied the better part of three months—June, July, and August—during which time the machines were not available to the veterans. A few, it was said, were permitted to act as helpers, and were set to drilling holes for weeks at a time in pieces of metal.

There was the case of Edward Comery, which was familiar to every soldier in the place. Comery was a truckman before the war, but a German bullet tore up his right arm and stiffened his fingers. When he was told the Government was going to give him an opportunity to learn a trade he told his friends that, "By Jove, the war had done him some good, anyhow."

He was sent to the Holmes School for sheet-metal work or mechanics. "I showed an adviser my fingers. He certainly saw I couldn't bend them," he said, "but here I am." He knows he will never be a mechanic. He has asked to be transferred. A training officer cut him off. Now, he has been told it is too late. He has six or seven months to go before the expiration of his training period, and then he expects to be turned out as a mechanic, with nothing but the label to indicate his connection with the trade.

Loccari, a little fellow with a gay face, shrugged his shoulders when I asked just how much instruction he received. "Well, personally I haven't been on a machine for three or four months. But when we get a machine by grabbing it, just as we are told to do, and staying up all night, then we don't have any tools, and when we have tools we don't have the machines—and that's what we learn about mechanics. You'll find some fellows who want to stay here. They think it's a cinch. They're lazy and don't care whether they learn or not, and say, 'Leave things alone and don't kick.' But it's a disgrace, and I don't know why they make us waste our time here. We'll be dumped into the street. What Grogan said is right. We'll be lucky if we learn to drive a nail straight."

And so the stories of discouragement and hopelessness ran seemingly without end. Here was a veteran whose body had been wasted by sickness—"Poor Jo Frick" they called him. He couldn't by the wildest stretch of the imagination ever perform the duties that mechanics are called upon to do. He has been asked to be readjusted into some other occupation more in keeping with his physical condition. Months have gone by and "Jo" still is hanging around the place. And there were many others to whom I spoke and whose tales were in the same strain.

"Why do they keep us here doing nothing? Why do they keep us here doing nothing?" was the usual plaint.

Upon leaving the place I observed a list of names written in a large, florid hand posted up near the exit. It was headed "Roll of Honor." I asked one of the trainees what the special service was that these men had been honored for. "What are you doing, kidding?" he smiled. "That's only a list of the names of the trainees in the school. Oh, we get a lot of honor all right. But—well, you saw the place. That's all."

UNION RULES BAR DOORS TO WAR CRIPPLES—POORLY TRAINED VETERANS, REFUSED MEMBERSHIP, MUST TAKE MEAN JOBS AT STARVATION WAGES—FOUR-YEAR "SCHOOLING" PROVES VALUELESS—HALF-BLIND MEN "TAUGHT" WATCHMAKING WHILE MAIMED LEARN PAINTING.

The troubles of the disabled veterans who have been misadvised by Government officials and placed for training in vocations in which they can not possibly succeed because of their infirmities are obvious and numerous enough. If, in addition, they have been placed in institutions—as hundreds of them have—where the instruction offered is but a pretense, their chances of being restored to a gainful occupation are virtually nil.

There are some schools, however, where a sincere effort is made to give the soldiers the rudiments of craftsmanship. Here, however, appears a new difficulty and one that is vital to every veteran receiving institutional training under Government direction.

It is the labor union.

Nearly all of the one hundred and seventy odd trades, which the men are being taught in 90 schools of the city, are thoroughly unionized. In many instances the labor organizations dominate the industry.

NO ENTRY FOR VETERAN.

For one reason or another they have in the main closed their doors to the rehabilitated veteran. The two, three, or four years' training the disabled man has received under the wing of the Federal Government is accounted of little value. His admission to this union or that is barred on the ground of inadequate training and apprenticeship, and the only employment opportunities left open to him are a few stray, low-paying, nonunion jobs.

Of this almost insurmountable barrier the veteran learns only on the eve of his discharge from training. Nothing, apparently, is told him of the problem at the time he is assigned to a trade. It seems to have been either entirely overlooked or given slight consideration by the Federal agencies charged with the responsibility of salvaging the broken soldier. Hundreds of men have been and are still being crowded into industries where the hold of the unions is indisputable, where their regulations are iron-bound and forbidding, where admission tests are of the strictest nature, and where the doors are practically closed to the veteran until he has served a long term of practical apprenticeship, as much as five years.

It is the stone wall toward which the great body of the 8,000 trainees in this city are heading.

"What is the use of all this training, anyhow," asked a veteran, "when the unions refuse to take us in at the end of our courses of instruction? They put us through severe tests, and if we have been assigned to an inefficient school or the course of training has been short, as it is in many of the trades, we fail. Few, if any, get in. It means that we must enter these trades as new men with apprentice wages. The two, three, or four years that the Government has put on us is wasted. Of course, there are a few nonunion jobs, but they're only a few, and pay low wages. It's a rotten situation."

The veterans, however, have only recently realized the seriousness of the union difficulties awaiting them at the expiration of their training time. At present they have no delusions about the matter and are hopeless enough about the outlook. There have been some meetings of committees with the labor men, but nothing definite has been accomplished. There has been no stirring of a finger, however, on the part of past Veterans' Bureau officials. What the present administration will do is problematical. There is no doubt that it should do something, and that quickly.

This phase of the rehabilitation muddle was most strikingly brought home to me on a visit to the branch of the College of the City of New York, at One hundred and fiftieth Street and Amsterdam Avenue, where there are about 500 disabled men under instruction in a dozen industries. Here were scores of men who had spent years in training in other institutions, who had been transferred to this school; and continued their instruction in sign painting, plumbing, printing (at the Lexington Avenue branch), and similar vocations, and who at the expiration of their period of training will find the doors of profitable employment closed to them, and their several years of preparation wasted.

What is to become of these men? How are they going to be rehabilitated in these trades? The unions say they can't possibly admit them on an equal basis because their training is inadequate and the small period of "placement" work, as the extra time allowed the veterans for practical experience at the end of their schooling is called, is all too small.

BEST TRAINING TOO HURRIED.

Perhaps there is some truth in the union contentions, but that, of course, does not mitigate the unfortunate predicament of the disabled veterans. Let us take a look at some of the courses at the City College branch. This school is conceded to be the best in the metropolitan area. The instructors are earnest, the facilities are fairly adequate, and a genuine effort is made to turn out good craftsmen in carpentry, cabinetmaking, shoe repairing, storage-battery work, plumbing, mechanical dentistry, tailoring, watchmaking, and a few other trades.

But here, as in other institutions, attempts are being made to turn out fine cabinetmakers in one and a half years, with a short period of placement training. Watchmakers are breathlessly developed in two and a half years, pressmen in 18 months, compositors in two years, and so on.

In all these trades the necessity for long periods of practical training is generally recognized. I have been informed by a watchmaker that good men in this industry must spend between 5 and 10 years in close application. In the printing industry the unions require an apprenticeship of five years. As for cabinetmaking, at its best really an art, I was told that those now assigned to and being trained in the course at City College couldn't learn it in 20 years.

TRADE ALREADY CROWDED.

Then there is the situation in the sign-painting class. There are altogether 800 union sign painters struggling to eke out a tolerable existence in this city. While there are but 35 or 40 men in this course at City College, more than 400 veterans have been crowded into this trade and are shortly to be rehabilitated in it. The union men say there isn't enough work now in the city for those already in the industry. They require a five-year apprenticeship for admission to their organization, and have so far declined to receive trainees who have not fulfilled this requirement.

The end of the training period of these sign-painting and show-card-writing soldiers is not far distant. What is going to happen when they are discharged? Where are they going to find work? Why were so many of them advised to take up this trade?

In this, as in nearly every other branch of training, we find misfits of all kinds. It appears to be no fault of the instructors in this particular school that men physically unable to go through even the motions of sign painting are retained in the class. They have repeatedly recommended their transfer, but no attention, it seems, is paid to their requests.

And so these soldiers are virtually forced to waste time, and soon their training period will be over, and although they have never touched brush or pencil to cardboard, they will be rehabilitated as "sign painters."

MOST OF CLASS MISFITS.

I was told that 30 out of an entire class of 40 in sign painting here should properly be readvised.

There is Isadore Mairowitz, for instance, a thin little fellow of 28, with a wife and two children. Mairowitz "got his" at Solissons, a bullet shattering his left hand, leaving three fingers limp. He was a tailor before the war. An adviser back in December, 1920, sent him to the defunct Lincoln Institute, with the request that he "be given something to do."

"They put me at sign painting," said Mairowitz, telling his story. "I told them it was a joke. How could I paint with my paralyzed hand? I asked to be transferred, but they kept me there until March, 1922, when the place was closed up, and then I was transferred to the East Side Y. M. C. A. Then, in July of 1922, I was sent here—all the time in sign painting."

"The instructors in the college know I can't do anything. I haven't learned a thing. It's a damn shame, because I would like to learn something so I could support myself and my family. They have written notes and everything to headquarters, and they don't even get an answer. Will you tell me why they keep a fellow like me here? I can't even hold a maulstick. What do you think is going to happen to me when I get out?"

"PAINTER" WITH BROKEN HAND.

Then here is the strange tale of Nathan Tare, who also had his left hand ripped up in France. They at first placed him in electric repair work, which was bad enough for his left hand, he said, and after wasting six months they sent him to Lincoln Institute, where he remained for a year doing nothing.

"I told them I wanted something useful to do," Tare said, "something that I could do and was fitted for. I thought poultry raising was all right and they agreed. They sent me up to Bronx Park apparently for instruction in poultry raising. I was there for six months and the only thing I was permitted to do was plant seeds. I never saw a chicken or any kind of a fowl in all that time. I kicked about it and they put me on a farm, but only let me stay there for a month."

"I don't know what it was all about, but suddenly they ordered me into auto repairing at the East Side Vulcanizing Co. Six months there knocked the stuffings out of my health, and then there was my bad hand. The doctor had me taken out of the place and here I am at sign painting, of all the things in the world. You can see for yourself how much sign painting I can do with this hand. I'm a good fighter. I was a pugilist before the war and made good money at it, but I'm no magician. Do you think they're going to keep us fellows stringing along this way without giving us a chance to do something we can do?"

The instructors in the school recommended Tare's transfer last November, but he is still "sign painting."

NO CHANCE TO REBEL.

The situation in the other classes and courses is about the same. Large numbers of men have physical disabilities of such a nature as to prevent their ever mastering the trades and making a living at it, but nevertheless are forced to continue aimlessly in the courses because they are helpless and need the \$100 a month which the Government allows them during the training period.

Samuel Berger, of 234 Moore Street, Brooklyn, is "just hanging around in the tailoring class," he says, because of a shattered wrist suffered in the Argonne. "See, it's the right wrist," he said, "and I can't do a thing with it, but they've had me doing sign painting. They must have a good laugh at that, and when they had enough, after about a year, they tried another little joke and put me at tailoring in this college. I can't thread a needle even, and they say, 'You be a tailor or nothing.' For two months I've just been coming here and going home. The instructor has recommended me for readjustment, but that's as far as it has gone. I guess they'll soon have the nerve to give me papers and say I've been restored to usefulness as a fine tailor. You'll see."

Berger has a wife and child.

Andrew Ermak was a fireman before the war, with a home at 149 Clinton Avenue, Maspeth, L. I. Ermak also has a wife and child. His health had been shot to pieces at Chateau-Thierry and he was hit by gas clouds in the Argonne and St. Mihiel. His eyes tear, he has chronic bronchitis, and his lungs are not too good. In 1921 he was placed at carpentry training and then switched to watchmaking.

PROTEST PROVES OF NO AVAIL.

"I've been here since last September in the watchmaking class," Ermak said. "First of all, I'm too nervous for that kind of work. Then my eyes are bad and the strain makes them worse. To tell you the truth, I am not doing a thing in the trade and I'm not getting anywhere. How can they expect me with bad eyes to be a watchmaker? Why, it's foolish. But it's a waste of time. I can't understand their object in keeping me in this kind of training. Yes, the college people have been trying to get me out of here. But there are dozens of other cases and nothing ever happens. It's a crime to waste our time this way."

John J. Gilroy tells a similar story. He was gassed and shot through one leg. An adviser placed him at vulcanizing and various other unsuitable occupations, and now since January, 1922, a bureau adviser has insisted on his going in for watchmaking.

"They have thrown away absolutely two years of my life, and I suppose I have two more years to go for the allotted period of training. I hope, for God's sake, I can learn something suited to my disability before I am through. Everybody knows it's crazy to have a man with bad eyes learning watchmaking. Why sometimes I can hardly tell the time. It's a pretty desperate outlook for me, I tell you, unless they wake up."

The complaint of Charles H. Weller is that being of delicate health the fumes of the gas burners used in the mechanical dentistry vocation are bad for his lungs; and also, having both his legs broken, the necessity of being kept on his feet for long periods of time in this trade causes him much pain. In addition, he says the trade is crowded, and there is no field worth talking about.

DENTISTRY TRAINING POPULAR.

"They said to me," Weller explained, "we'll let you take up shoe-making or else you stick to mechanical dentistry." Well, I decided I'd rather waste my time in mechanical dentistry than shoemaking. It's funny, though. They want everybody to be a tailor or a shoemaker or a mechanical dentist. People don't wear out shoes any faster than they did before, nor pants, nor teeth. I don't know what they're going to do with the fellows in these courses, even if they turn out something. There is the union and all that. I've got about two more years to go. After that, I guess, the air for me."

George St. John tried to get around his case by making a proposition to the bureau adviser. A bullet tore one of the nerves in St. John's neck and has rendered him deaf in one ear. He was a music student before the war and was training his voice for a career on the stage. When he appeared for vocational training he proposed that the Government permit him six months of voice culture, and that he would be thoroughly satisfied with this. The defective ear, he said, would be no obstacle. The adviser told him he would have to take up some trade.

"But I don't want to learn mechanical dentistry or anything like that," he says he told the adviser. "I want to have my voice trained. It's what I am going to do in life, and I want only six months of it."

"But he told me," St. John related, "it couldn't be done, that he thought I would make a good mechanical dentist—me, mind you, a mechanical dentist—and that I'd have to take this or nothing. Well, I needed the money, and I had to submit. I've been in training as a mechanical dentist for two years, and I know very little about it because my heart is not in it. I don't believe I could make \$10 a week at it. I'm all broken up about it, to be frank with you, because if I don't get this little chance I want it may mean the wrecking of my life."

75 PER CENT ARE HOPELESS.

It was the same story in classroom after classroom—men here and there sitting idly about, with little or no interest in the vocation to which they are bound without any apparent reason, physically incapable, in many cases, of performing the ordinary duties of that vocation and with nothing to do but wait for something to happen. It was at this school—admittedly the best in the city—that I was informed that fully 75 per cent of the veterans being trained in various makeshift institutions in the city will never really become working craftsmen in the trades in which they are being instructed.

An attempt to account for a certain portion of these is made by the assertion that even under ordinary circumstances 30 per cent of the workers could never be taught a trade. Then the question arises, Why are not the other 45 per cent taken care of? What a tremendous waste of time! What a discouraged and hopeless outlook these battered souls must have! What can they be thinking of the governmental agencies responsible for their situation?

LEG MAIMED, SOLDIER GIVEN CHORUS JOB—\$10 A WEEK PLACE IN MUSICAL SHOW GOES TO CRIPPLE GIEN VOCATIONAL "TRAINING" AS AUTO MECHANIC—ANOTHER FAILS IN TEST FOR JANITOR—MEN ASSESS THEIR REQUESTS FOR SUITABLE SCHOOLING HAVE LITTLE OR NO EFFECT.

The disabled veteran sent through a vocational school by the Government after all is interested mainly in obtaining fairly permanent work at reasonable pay to support himself and his dependents. We have seen how he has been frequently misadvised and his time wasted through neglect and incompetence. The Government has undertaken to find this job for him upon his becoming proficient in the occupation for which he has been trained. Is the soldier getting this job? There are indications that he is having a hard time of it.

Let us glance at the experience of a few of them.

There is Bennie Bershad, whose services with the Seventy-seventh Division in the Argonne won him a shattered leg, tear-gassed eyes, and an affected lung. He looks big and husky when one first sees him, but he turns out to be a weakened hulk. He has a wife and baby, and tried to make the \$135 a month the Government allowed him while in training to cover the expenses of their humble home at 769 Ninth Avenue.

DENIED TRAINING AS CUTTER.

He was a motorman before the war, but he couldn't go back to that work because the wound in his leg made it impossible to stand on his feet for any length of time. He told the training officers back in 1919 that he would like to be a cutter, but they denied him training in this, he says, for no reason that he could understand. They merely suggested that he go in for a study of auto mechanism.

He spent a year in a school without picking up a thing, he says, and then he was placed in various auto shops and factories to get practical experience, but the fumes and the nature of the work was too much for him. He was sent the rounds of various garages, however, he relates, his health getting worse each day, and doing very little besides cleaning cars and towing about broken-down trucks and automobiles. This process continued, he said, from July 26, 1920, until September 30, 1922, when he was declared rehabilitated.

"But you don't know how funny it is," he explained. "After being shoved around from one shop to another and not learning a thing about engines or anything real about the mechanics of automobiles, they suddenly tell me I'm graduated as an expert auto mechanic. Can't you see how crazy it is?"

"Well," he continued, "they told me to wait awhile and they would get me a job. So I waited. One week later I got a letter from the Veterans' Bureau, telling me to go to the Al Jolson theater; that there was a job for me. Every time I think about it I have to laugh all over again. I went up there, and I saw a man. I forget his name, and I told him who I was and about the letter from the bureau, and asked him about the job."

GETS JOB AS BUTTERFLY.

"Well, he took me in, and they blackened my face and put a kind of a butterfly costume on me and started to run me around for two hours. I was surprised. I didn't know what it was all about. I went to the man again and I said I was an auto mechanic and that I was rehabilitated as an auto mechanic, and I didn't know what all this monkey business was all about, and where was the mechanic job."

"He says that was the job—what I was doing—running around as a butterfly. I says, 'On the level?' And he said, 'Yes; we'll give you \$10 a week to play in this show doing this.' Well, I thought it was a joke, but he said, 'It's right.' I just laughed out loud. I thought somebody was crazy. Here I was an auto mechanic—they

trained me for an auto mechanic for three years and they rehabilitate me in the trade as an expert—but I am not kidding myself about that, either—but they put me down as such and then they offer me a job to be a butterfly in a play."

"But you ought to see what the letter said that I got from the bureau at the time. It said, 'If you are interested in earning some extra money at night, it is suggested that you call at the stage-door entrance of the above-named theater.' Do you get that extra-money business? Why, I wasn't doing a thing and was waiting for them to get me a job, and they talk about 'extra money.' It was a funny way of putting it, wasn't it? He must of thought I was pulling an income down from the clouds. Anyway, that's the way they tried to rehabilitate me as an auto mechanic—make a butterfly actor out of me. Can you imagine me being a butterfly?"

IS FINALLY REPLACED.

After a short interval of waiting again and after Bennie's condition had become desperate, he was replaced for training in auto mechanism at the Howard Motor Co., where he has been since October 27 and where he is to stay until March, when he has been informed he will be again rehabilitated.

"I do a little valve grinding here and washing up and towing, but I know I'm not learning much about auto mechanics," he concluded. "Maybe they think I'll be a better butterfly with six months more of auto mechanics, eh?"

James Foley, of Astoria, Long Island, N. Y., had enough trouble, too, in landing a job. Foley developed trench foot overseas, and it was decided by the training officers that he ought to master the watchmaking trade. He spent one year or thereabouts in the New York Watchmaking Academy, at Astoria, and then was rehabilitated as a master craftsman in the trade. He was put on the list for employment and spent several weeks in quest of work. The best offer he could get was \$10 a week, he says. He needed the work, but he needed more money, so he was compelled to supplement his earnings as a watchmaker by working nights cleaning automobiles in a garage.

NEED FIVE YEARS' TRAINING.

"How can a man be expected to learn watchmaking in a year?" he asks. "Any watchmaker will tell you that five years of the closest application are necessary to turn out a good skilled worker in this trade. And the job that they are supposed to get for you—well, a lot of fellows have been waiting months for it."

"Are all the men in the New York watchmaking school turned out after a year's instruction?" I asked.

He replied that the course was really two and a half years, and that there were veterans there with disabilities which would prevent their ever turning out watchmakers in a hundred years.

And there is the experience of Carmelo Lafragola, of 492 Sixteenth Street, Brooklyn. Lafragola was wounded in the right arm and can do little with it. Nevertheless, he was placed in training for the tailoring business. The strain on the arm, of course, was painful and Lafragola learned little, if anything, about tailoring. In fact, he says he learned nothing about it in the three years and eight months he spent in one school or another, finally winding up at the College of the City of New York. He was actually declared rehabilitated as a tailor, without having made more than half a dozen stitches in his entire training period.

COULDN'T GET JANITOR JOB.

When it came to obtaining a place in the trade for which he had been trained, he was recommended for a janitor's position and sent to fill out an application for it. He failed to get the job.

But this is enough. Instance after instance could be cited showing the trouble the veterans have landing places after they are listed as having completed their training. It is a general complaint, also, that they frequently are offered jobs in occupations other than those they have spent so many years learning. A soldier who has been in training for years as an embalmer tells me he was rehabilitated as a night watchman, while another who had been studying bookkeeping says he was sent back to earn a living as a messenger.

No attempt could be made, of course, to look into every one of the three thousand odd cases in which I was told by Veterans' Bureau officials men had been rehabilitated and placed in some trade out of a total of more than 19,034 that had entered training in this district. But the many instances similar to those just cited which have come under my observation during the course of the inquiry indicates that there is room for much improvement in that phase of the Government's rehabilitation work.

RED TAPE BINDS 2,000 NEW YORK WAR CRIPPLES—MORE EFFICIENT INSTRUCTORS IN VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS, ADDITIONAL HOSPITALS FOR DISABLED MEN NECESSARY NOW, INVESTIGATION DISCLOSES.

If the disabled veterans in this district were asked to detail the difficulties of their admission to vocational training under Government direction, the nature of their instruction and the probable chances of their really being restored to a gainful and useful occupation, 75 out of every 100, I believe, would tell of the wearing red tape involved in the filing of claims for occupational instruction, the drawn-out discussion of their eligibility, their registration and eventual advisement as to the type of vocation they are to pursue.

They would relate how they are consulted on their preference for a particular occupation and how their wishes are usually ignored, and how an advisor says, finally, "You be a shoemaker," or "You be a mechanical dentist," (nearly every one of them are asked to go in for mechanical dentistry), or "You be a tailor, or a sign painter, and a few other trades to which the advisor at the time happens to take a fancy, and how if the veterans object, they are given the final injunction, "This or nothing."

MUST TAKE WHAT'S GIVEN.

They will recount how, being helpless and in sore need of the \$100 or more a month which the Government allows them while in training and which they will not receive if they do not take the trade assigned them, they finally accept training in the occupation and find themselves in an institution where the vocation is supposed to be taught.

They will relate how they may find themselves among the fourth or third or even half of the men who have been misadvised and will, obviously, never be able to learn the trade because of their physical disability, or who have no interest in it temperamentally and will never make any progress in it.

They will tell how the school may be lacking in facilities, how it is just one of a batch of mushroom institutions where no genuine effort is made to turn out skillful craftsmen or any interest taken in their welfare.

TRANSFER CALLED IMPOSSIBLE.

They will sadly recount their repeated efforts to have themselves transferred to another occupation or school, of the interminable delays of months and sometimes years, and how it frequently winds up with their being kept at the trade for which they are not physically fitted, in which they are making no progress, and through which they could never hope to make a living.

They will tell how, after wasting several years, they may receive a notice that in three months or six months their period of training is to end (it is not to exceed four years); that they are to be placed for a short period in "placement training," (for practical experience), and that they are then to be rehabilitated; that is, declared restored to a useful and gainful occupation.

They will tell at last how, on the eve of their being thrown on their own resources, they will find themselves inadequately trained and unprepared, how the unions bar them from their organizations, and consequently from the best-paying positions, and how the trade which they are supposed to enter is already overcrowded, with no jobs available or those hardly paying a living wage.

MAY GET MESSENGER JOB.

In conclusion, they will relate how they may find themselves forced to take a job that has nothing to do with the trade for which they have been trained and may wind up as watchmen instead of tailors, or messengers instead of bookkeepers, their three or four years of special schooling, for which it has been estimated the Government is spending \$14,000 a man, proving a pure waste of time.

The crisis for about 2,000 of these former soldiers will be here in a few months. They have been notified that their periods of training are about to expire. Their monthly \$100 or more allowed by the Government during their training period will be cut off.

What is to be done about these men?

What steps should be taken to remedy the conditions that have made this situation possible? The cases of misadvisement cited are only a suggestion of the hundreds that have come under the eye of the writer. The schools referred to are merely illustrative of what is taking place in dozens of others. The facts point unmistakably in certain definite directions.

ACTION IS NECESSARY.

It is obvious, first of all, that those directly responsible for the occupational advisement of the soldiers were either judgment blind or incompetent. It is plain that the veterans should be taken out of occupations for which they are not fit and placed in trades less crowded and for which they are suited. The union question should be considered.

It is obvious, too, that many of the institutions to which the soldiers are sent were not created for the welfare of the men, are not really interested in their vocational progress, lack the facilities for their proper training, and should be abolished at the earliest possible moment.

It is obvious, too, that the continual changes in district managers here is in the last analysis the chief reason for the chaotic conditions. In the last 14 months there have been 8 district managers, and in less than a year 18 chiefs of training. No sooner does a manager begin to get a glimpse of the true situation when he is whisked away.

In addition there are indications that the district chief has been hampered in efforts to clean house by an unwelcome accession of incompetent subordinates, whom he appears powerless to rid himself of. Little headway can be expected unless the manager is given a free hand in dealing with the situation as he sees it, and his policies continued for a reasonable length of time.

The present manager of this district, Maj. E. F. Lent, while in office only five months, has already shown a clear understanding of the problem, in the opinion of those who are conversant with it. He has no delusions about the situation and has planned to take some vigorous steps to solve it.

WILL CALL IN ADVISERS.

In this connection it is understood that he proposes to call in the help of the most competent brains of the community in an advisory capacity.

No one has taken a deeper interest in the situation nor can speak more authoritatively on the soldiers' problem than Col. Cornelius W. Wickersham, chairman of the hospital committee of the American Legion, Department of New York. His views follow:

"The problem to-day in New York State is twofold:

"First. We need an additional Government hospital for the care of mental and shell-shock cases. Under the Veterans' Bureau the country is divided into 14 districts. Ours is the second, embracing New York, Connecticut, and New Jersey. In this district there are at the present time 342 veterans of the war suffering from shell shock and mental diseases in one Government hospital in the Bronx, and there are 826 such men scattered throughout various contract hospitals over the three States.

"The State government has given some relief to this most disturbing situation by setting aside portions of the fine State hospital at Kings Park for these men. There are at present 178 veterans at that institution. The public must understand that a bed in a general hospital is of no use to cure a shell-shock or mental case. Special equipment and special treatment are needed for this class of cases, and these can be best, and in some cases only, furnished in a hospital built and equipped for the purpose. The number of these cases is still increasing, and an additional Government hospital for mental cases, with facilities for 1,000 beds is an imperative need—not 10 years from to-day, but now—if we are to save the minds of a majority of these men and give them a reasonable chance for cure.

FOURTEEN THOUSAND RECEIVING TRAINING.

"Second. We have the problem of rehabilitation. There are approximately 14,000 disabled veterans now receiving training in the second district looking toward their rehabilitation as useful citizens able to make their own way in the world.

"Two kinds of training are given, namely, placement training, which means the placing of a man in a business, store, shop, or factory where he can learn his new trade under working conditions; the other is institutional training—that is, where a man is given free a course at a law school, medical school, accounting school or other institution for teaching him the theory and practice of a business or profession.

"It will be seen at once that many problems confront the Veterans' Bureau in its sincere endeavor to accomplish the rehabilitation of these men. One of the present problems is the difficulty of maintaining contact with the men in placement training and of seeing that a man receives the kind of training for which he is best fitted. In the past there have been many misfits—men who because of their disability

were unable to engage in certain trades or occupations but who, nevertheless, were started in course of training in these very trades or occupations. Other men have been placed in kinds of training for which they had no qualifications and in which they could not be happy or successful. There has been a lack of adequate attention to these individual cases, and the result is that only a small percentage of the large number of men whom the Government has undertaken to rehabilitate have completed their training and are actually rehabilitated.

"The problem is further complicated by the fact that any inefficient method of dealing with it will inevitably tend toward pauperization and not toward true rehabilitation and the placing of a man on his feet where he can make his own way in the world. This problem is one that peculiarly requires the sympathetic interest of all members of the community and such cooperation with the Veterans' Bureau as will best assist that organization in obtaining real results.

"The American Legion is now working along these lines, as well as endeavoring to assist in the solution of the many minor problems of this great work."

Col. Lee Garnett Day, chairman of the rehabilitation committee of the American Legion, second district, for the past year, offers the following comment and suggestions:

"If compensation and health for the crippled of the late war could be redeemed like Liberty bond coupons, these few lines would be unnecessary. Rehabilitation and study of a useful trade, like a new subway, is not gained on tracks of pen and ink. Two tuberculosis hospitals were approved for New York State last summer, one at Tupper Lake and the other at Beacon. Col. R. C. Forbes, national Director of the Veterans' Bureau, promised foundations before frost set in last fall. What is the delay? When will they be finished? Will it be 1924, 1925, or 1930? If we were now actually at war, would not public opinion and the necessities of war demand their construction at all possible speed?

"Four hundred and thirty million dollars will be disbursed by the Veterans' Bureau in Washington in the fiscal year of 1923. The second district, in which is included our New York, has a pay roll and overhead of more than \$2,500,000 for 1923. Sixty-five million dollars is the contemplated budget for the fiscal year. The local bureau has had a rough road in administration. Eight different directors in rapid succession have been attempting to organize 140,000 claim folders, 26,000 monthly compensations, and 12,000 training programs. A thousand individuals have fought to find their missing claim files, but few have tried to see from a district manager's chair what red tape and politics can do to discourage hope and efficiency.

OFFICERS ARE CRITICIZED.

"There are more than 6,000 men taking vocational training, and approximately 5,000 are in placement training in New York City alone. It has been shown, and we were long cognizant of it, that the greater part of these men were assigned to their training by training officers who had not the broad experience to consider or judge their qualifications, both mental and physical, with regard to their previous trade or business experience before entering the war, their hereditary history, the extent of their disability, the effect of the war upon their mentality, knowledge of the trades that could absorb them, or the sincerity of the schools professing to give a capable and honest tuition.

"The remedy is a revamping of not only the men themselves but the schools, and what is perhaps of greater importance, a constant surveillance of the men. The mushroom schools, however, should be cleaned out at once.

"Again, there have been too many managers. A continuance of policy must be assured. The manager must be afforded the unrestricted freedom of selecting his associates. He should be allowed to build up contact with a group of prominent medical advisers in tuberculosis, neuropsychiatric and vocational cases. It should be recognized that the Government is not as fully qualified to handle special cases as are outside agencies which have made this province their special study.

CITIZENS SHOULD HELP.

"The district manager, too, should be encouraged to make contacts with groups of business men, who could no doubt be able to coordinate the specific requirements of the men now in training. It is useless, however, for citizens' committees and well-meaning individuals to offer their services if the Government does not wish them, but as these citizens were invited to prepare for war and carry it through, we do not think that it is out of the Government's scope to ask the assistance of chambers of commerce and business men's organizations, who by virtue of their membership are more conversant with the past, present, and future conditions.

"One special word on the matter of advisement. It is difficult to suggest an increase in salary for this position in New York alone. It is a vital matter, however, to the men. There must be an adequate mind to deal with the veteran's case when he comes up for advisement or readjustment, as the whole course of a man's life is influenced by the judgment as to the trade or profession he is to pursue. I would suggest that the Government and the bureau officials give this subject their closest attention if the training problem is to be intelligently dealt with."

Let us turn for a moment to the medical and hospital care that is given the disabled man before he is prepared for vocational training. The situation at present is said to be fairly satisfactory in certain respects only. Tales of neglect in this hospital or that continue to reach the ear of the public, and the demands for additional space adequately to care for the sick and wounded are being made from time to time of the governmental agencies charged with the care of the disabled veteran.

MANY PATIENTS ARE TREATED.

The latest records show that large numbers of tubercular soldiers are still distributed through private and State hospitals in the metropolitan area, that there are 284 in private sanatoriums and houses at Saranac, 81 at Liberty, and 829 in State hospitals and asylums. At New Haven, the only Federal institution in this district for the care of tubercular patients, there are 500 veterans. This, however, does not begin to account for the entire number of men suffering from this trouble alone in the second district, the number really running from 5,500 to 6,000.

It is complained, however, that these men do not receive every care that they should, not from any deliberate neglect, but because they are generally crowded into institutions already hard pressed for space and where they can't possibly receive the close attention they should. In addition it is represented that the laxness and freedom of some of the boarding places where many of the men have been

temporarily placed are certainly not conducive to a speedy cure of the veterans, and that the discipline and strictness of the Government conducted institution is necessary if the soldier is to be adequately taken care of and restored to health.

The Government has therefore been urged to complete at the earliest possible time the two new tubercular hospitals at Chelsea and Tupper Lake.

ELEVEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY-EIGHT NERVOUS CASES.

With the respect to the care of the nervous and mentally diseased cases it is pointed out that there are 1,168 patients afflicted with these troubles now distributed in 26 institutions throughout the State, and that only 342 of them are in a Government hospital—the United States Veterans' Hospital, No. 81, in the Bronx.

Organizations interested in the welfare of the veterans will insist that the Government build an additional hospital of at least 1,000 beds in the State for mental cases; that a general medical and surgical hospital be built in this city of a capacity of 250 beds, and that the use of the hospital at Ward's Island for mental cases be gradually discontinued, the number of patients and facilities at Kings Park State Hospital to be increased until the new Government mental hospital is provided.

To expose a bad situation without suggesting the remedy for it is a futile process. The Tribune, in the above series of articles, has shown the ineptness, the inefficiency, the misunderstanding, on which rests the Government's vocational training for New York's veterans of the World War.

What remedial step seems best?

It seems clear from the Tribune's evidence that the main reason for the bad conditions has been the constant "turn-over" due, probably, to politics. The fault does not lie with the local control for the moment. Maj. W. F. Lent is the best chief Veterans' Bureau District No. 2 has had; but he inherits a situation made by a half dozen predecessors, each of whom held office but a few months.

The fact is that the Veterans' Bureau as a whole needs a larger visioned management than has ever been accorded it. It is literally true to say that no American is too big for this national responsibility. Leonard Wood—doctor and administrator—would not have been too big for the job. But Wood is tied to the Philippines. The administration's other doctor and administrator is Postmaster General Work. Even a Cabinet officer is not too big for the job, and informed opinion in Army circles knows that the job is not too big for Doctor Work.

The administration has faced an irrepressible conflict over the soldiers' bonus. That conflict bids fair to break forth again. Most of its passion and prejudice rest upon the Government's mishandling of the wounded, sick, or mentally affected soldiers of the World War. An American of the first rank in charge of the Veterans' Bureau would not only accomplish a great service in the reduction of sheer human misery; he would also take the grievance out of the bonus issue by assuring the country that a grateful Government was taking proper care of its injured sons.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana moves that all debate on the paragraph be now closed.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas] having resumed the chair, Mr. McARTHUR, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 13696) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

There was no demand for a separate vote, and the amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion to recommit.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit. I am against the bill. I do not know whether the gentleman from Tennessee is or not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from Tennessee against the bill?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I am.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee moves to recommit the bill, H. R. 13696, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same forthwith with the following amendment: At the end of the last paragraph on page 34 insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"No part of the sums appropriated in this act shall be used in the preparation or dissemination of any propaganda, arguments, or state-

ments in favor of or in opposition to the passage of legislation: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall prevent the preparation of data and statements solely for presentation at hearings of congressional committees or to Members of Congress in response to requests for such information."

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the motion to recommit, that it is not germane to the subject matter and is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If the gentleman will yield, I call attention to the fact that this direct question was ruled on in Committee of the Whole, and the point of order was overruled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. What does the gentleman from Tennessee say about the proviso which the Chair is informed was not presented in the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. No; it was not in the one that was offered and acted upon, but that is in accord with the proviso in the preceding paragraph and deals with substantially the same subject. It simply restricts the legislation, and, taken as a whole, it undoubtedly constitutes a clear limitation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Tennessee contend that the proviso goes back to the limitation?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. An exception to the limitation. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee to recommit the bill with instructions.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee) there were—ayes 27, noes 52.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 77, nays 141, not voting 211, as follows:

YEAS—77.

Abernethy	Favrot	Lyon	Stearns
Almon	Fields	McClintic	Stedman
Aswell	Fisher	McDuffie	Stevenson
Bell	Garner	Maloney	Swank
Black	Garrett, Tenn.	Mansfield	Ten Eyck
Bland, Va.	Hayden	Montague	Thomas
Blanton	Huddleston	Moore, Va.	Turner
Bowling	Humphreys, Miss.	Nelson, J. M.	Tucker
Box	Jeffers, Ala.	O'Connor	Turner
Briggs	Jones, Tex.	Parks, Ark.	Tyson
Bulwinkle	Ketcham	Quin	Upshaw
Byrnes, S. C.	Kincheloe	Raker	Vinson
Byrns, Tenn.	Lanham	Rankin	Weaver
Carter	Lankford	Rayburn	Wilson
Collier	Larsen, Ga.	Rossdale	Wingo
Connally, Tex.	Lazaro	Rouse	Wise
Davis, Tenn.	Lea, Calif.	Sanders, Tex.	Wright
Deal	Lee, Ga.	Sandlin	
Driver	London	Sears	
Dupré	Lowrey	Sisson	

NAYS—141.

Andrews, Nebr.	Dallinger	Kearns	Radcliffe
Anthony	Dempsey	Kelly, Pa.	Ramseyer
Appleby	Denison	Kissel	Reed, N. Y.
Atkeson	Dickinson	Kissel	Rhodes
Bacharach	Dowell	Kopp	Ricketts
Barbour	Dunbar	Kraus	Roach
Beck	Elliot	Lampert	Robison
Begg	Faust	Leatherwood	Sanders, Ind.
Bird	Fess	Longworth	Scott, Tenn.
Bland, Ind.	Fish	McArthur	Shaw
Boies	Fitzgerald	McCormick	Shelton
Bond	Foster	McLaughlin, Mich.	Shreve
Brown, Tenn.	Freeman	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Siegel
Burdick	French	MacGregor	Sinclair
Burrighs	Frithingham	MacLafferty	Sinnot
Burtess	Fuller	Madden	Smith, Idaho
Campbell, Kans.	Gerner	Magee	Speaks
Campbell, Pa.	Graham, Ill.	Mapes	Sproul
Chinblom	Green, Iowa	Michener	Stafford
Christopherson	Greene, Mass.	Miller	Stephens
Clarke, N. Y.	Greene, Vt.	Mondell	Strong, Kans.
Clouse	Griest	Moore, Ohio	Strong, Pa.
Cole, Iowa	Hadley	Moore, Ind.	Summers, Wash.
Cole, Ohio	Hardy, Colo.	Morgan	Swing
Colton	Haugen	Mott	Taylor, Tenn.
Cooper, Ohio	Haves	Murphy	Temple
Copley	Herrick	Nelson, Me.	Thompson
Coughlin	Hickey	Newton, Mo.	Tilson
Cramton	Hicks	Norton	Timberlake
Crowther	Hill	Parker, N. Y.	Tinkham
Curry	Huck	Paul	Towner
	Humphrey, Nebr.	Purnell	Underhill

Vaile
Vestal
Voigt
Volstead

Wason
Watson
Webster
White, Kans.

Williams, Ill.
Williamson
Wood, Ind.
Wurzbach

Young

NOT VOTING—211.

Ackerman
Anderson
Andrew, Mass.
Ansoerge
Arentz
Bankhead
Barkley
Beedy
Benham
Bixler
Blakeney
Bowers
Brand
Brennan
Britten
Brooks, Ill.
Brooks, Pa.
Brown, Wis.
Buchanan
Burke
Burton
Butler
Cable
Cannon
Cantrill
Carew
Chalmers
Chandler, N. Y.
Chandler, Okla.
Clark, Fla.
Casson
Cockran
Codd
Collins
Connolly, Pa.
Cooper, Wis.
Crago
Crisp
Cullen
Dale
Darrow
Davis, Minn.
Dominick
Doughton
Drane
Drewry
Dunn
Drer
Echols
Edmonds
Ellis
Evans
Fairchild

Fairfield
Fenn
Focht
Fordney
Frear
Free
Fulmer
Funk
Gahn
Gallivan
Garrett, Tex.
Gensman
Gifford
Gilbert
Glynn
Goldsborough
Goodykoontz
Gorman
Gould
Graham, Pa.
Griffin
Hammer
Hardy, Tex.
Hawley
Hays
Henry
Hersey
Himes
Hoch
Hogan
Hooker
Hudspeth
Hukriede
Hull
Husted
Hutchinson
Ireland
Jacoway
James
Jefferis, Nebr.
Johnson, Ky.
Johnson, Miss.
Johnson, S. Dak.
Johnson, Wash.
Jones, Pa.
Kahn
Keller
Kelley, Mich.
Kendall
Kennedy
Kindred
King
Kirkpatrick

Kitchin
Klecza
Kline, N. Y.
Kline, Pa.
Knight
Knutson
Kreider
Kunz
Langley
Larson, Minn.
Lawrence
Layton
Lee, N. Y.
Lehlbach
Lineberger
Linthicum
Little
Logan
Luce
Luhning
McFadden
McKenzie
McLaughlin, Pa.
McPherson
McSwain
Martin
Mead
Merritt
Michaelson
Mills
Montoya
Moore, Ill.
Morin
Mudd
Nelson, A. P.
Newton, Minn.
O'Brien
Ogden
Oldfield
Oliver
Olpp
Osborne
Overstreet
Paige
Park, Ga.
Parker, N. J.
Patterson, Mo.
Patterson, N. J.
Perkins
Perlman
Petersen
Porter
Pou

Pringey
Rainey, Ala.
Rainey, Ill.
Ransley
Reber
Reece
Reed, W. Va.
Riddick
Riordan
Robertson
Rodenberg
Rogers
Rose
Rosenbloom
Rucker
Ryan
Sabath
Sanders, N. Y.
Schall
Scott, Mich.
Slemp
Smith, Mich.
Snell
Snayder
Steenerson
Stiness
Stoll
Sullivan
Summers, Tex.
Sweet
Tague
Taylor, Ark.
Morin
Taylor, Colo.
Taylor, N. J.
Thorpe
Tillman
Tinchler
Treadway
Volk
Walters
Ward, N. Y.
Ward, N. C.
Wheeler
White, Me.
Williams, Tex.
Winslow
Woodruff
Woods, Va.
Woodyard
Wyant
Yates
Zihlman

Mr. Codd with Mr. Mead.
Mr. Gorman with Mr. Hooker.
Mr. Brennan with Mr. Riordan.
Mr. Osborne with Mr. Kitchin.
Mr. Edmonds with Mr. Taylor of Colorado.
Mr. Kendall with Mr. Sullivan.
Mr. Tinchler with Mr. Ward of North Carolina.
Mr. Johnson of South Dakota with Mr. Hudspeth.
Mr. Britten with Mr. Logan.
Mr. Rose with Mr. Rucker.
Mr. Snyder with Mr. Kunz.
Mr. Hoch with Mr. Summers of Texas.
Mr. Lawrence with Mr. Sabath.
Mr. Scott of Michigan with Mr. Overstreet.
Mr. Johnson of Washington with Mr. Rainey of Illinois.
Mr. Treadway with Mr. Woods of Virginia.
Mr. Winslow with Mr. Collins.
Mr. Perkins with Mr. Williams of Texas.
Mr. McFadden with Mr. Stoll.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Taylor of Arkansas.
Mr. Taylor of New Jersey with Mr. Tillman.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
A quorum being present, the doors were opened.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question now is on the passage of the bill.
The question was taken, and the bill was passed.
On motion of Mr. Wood of Indiana, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

MILITARY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. ANTHONY, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 13793; Rept. No. 1397) making appropriations for military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying report, ordered printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee reserves all points of order.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for a change of reference of House Concurrent Resolution 77 from the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Reserving the right to object, what is the character of the resolution?

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, the resolution provides for the appointment of a commission to make investigations concerning the silver situation, the production of silver. It is a resolution dealing entirely with the production of silver and has nothing to do at all with the subject of coinage, weights, and measures. The Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures consents to the change.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Well, it just strikes me from what the gentleman states about it that this probably ought to go to the Committee on Rules. Does it increase the power of the Committee on Mines and Mining, or the power which any other committee possesses?

Mr. COLTON. No; it simply provides for an investigating committee to be appointed by the President of the United States.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That would go to the Committee on Rules, I would say to the gentleman, in the regular order of business. Is there any hurry about it? Will not the gentleman defer his request until Monday?

Mr. COLTON. I think there is no hurry about it, and I would just as soon defer the matter until Monday as not.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Let us have a chance to look into it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah withdraws his request for the present.

CONFERENCE REPORT—INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the Interior Department appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan calls up the conference report on the Interior Department appropriation bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. And ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:
Until further notice:

Mr. Ellis with Mr. Crisp.
Mr. Bixler with Mr. Fulmer.
Mr. Michaelson with Mr. Doughton.
Mr. Davis of Minnesota with Mr. Johnson of Kentucky.
Mr. Hutchinson with Mr. Brand.
Mr. Paige with Mr. Hammer.
Mr. Ackerman with Mr. Goldsborough.
Mr. Kahn with Mr. Cockran.
Mr. McPherson with Mr. Gallivan.
Mr. Brooks of Illinois with Mr. O'Brien.
Mr. Porter with Mr. Bankhead.
Mr. Fenn with Mr. Drewry.
Mr. Mudd with Mr. Park of Georgia.
Mr. Beedy with Mr. McSwain.
Mr. Patterson of Missouri with Mr. Cantrill.
Mr. Graham of Pennsylvania with Mr. Pou.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Kindred.
Mr. Burton with Mr. Cullen.
Mr. Moore of Illinois with Mr. Oliver.
Mr. Hukriede with Mr. Jacoway.
Mr. Dunn with Mr. Barkley.
Mr. Fordney with Mr. Gilbert.
Mr. Olpp with Mr. Drane.
Mr. Butler with Mr. Martin.
Mr. King with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. Langley with Mr. Clark of Florida.
Mr. Bowers with Mr. Tague.
Mr. Keller with Mr. Linthicum.
Mr. Free with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. Patterson of New Jersey with Mr. Garrett of Texas.
Mr. Rogers with Mr. Dominick.
Mr. Cable with Mr. Johnson of Mississippi.
Mr. Snell with Mr. Carew.
Mr. Lehlbach with Mr. Oldfield.
Mr. Anderson with Mr. Hardy of Texas.
Mr. A. P. Nelson with Mr. Rainey of Alabama.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. And asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read the statement.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13559) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 24, 25, 29, 32, 34, 35, 38, 41, 43, and 47.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 5, 6, 14, 15, 20, 21, 22, 23, 27, 33, 44, 46, 50, 51, 52, 54, and 56, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$11,730"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$19,230"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$365,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "Provided further, That not to exceed \$50,000 of this appropriation may be used for surveys and resurveys under the rectangular system provided by law of public lands deemed to be valuable for oil and oil shale"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$280,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,670,190"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 97 of the bill, in line 4, strike out "\$1,727,700" and insert "\$1,769,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$35,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "\$73,000, including not exceeding \$35,000 for completion of the widening of the Nisqually entrance to Paradise Valley Road"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$97,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed on amendments numbered 1, 2, 30, 31, 36, 37, and 53.

LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
BURTON L. FRENCH,
C. D. CARTER,

Managers on the part of the House.

REED SMOOT,
CHARLES CURTIS,
WM. J. HARRIS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13559) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report:

On No. 3: Authorizes telephone service, as proposed by the Senate, to be paid from the appropriation for contingent expenses for the Department of the Interior.

On No. 4: Makes the appropriation of \$5,000 for an automobile for the Secretary of the Interior "immediately available," as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 5 and 6: Appropriates \$41,900, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$41,000, as proposed by the House, for printing and binding for the Bureau of Mines.

On No. 7: Restores the appropriation of \$15,000, carried in the bill as it passed the House and stricken out by the Senate, for the suppression of the traffic in intoxicating liquors among the natives of Alaska.

On Nos. 8 and 9: Appropriates \$11,730, instead of \$11,100, as proposed by the House, and \$12,300, as proposed by the Senate, for clerk hire in the office of the surveyor general for Alaska.

On Nos. 10 and 11: Appropriates \$15,820, as proposed by the House, instead of \$16,120, as proposed by the Senate, for clerk hire in the office of the surveyor general for Arizona.

On Nos. 12 and 13: Appropriates \$12,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$13,500, as proposed by the Senate, for clerk hire in the office of the surveyor general for California.

On Nos. 14 and 15: Appropriates \$14,520, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$11,100, as proposed by the House, for clerk hire in the office of the surveyor general for Colorado.

On Nos. 16 and 17: Appropriates \$13,180, as proposed by the House, instead of \$14,000, as proposed by the Senate, for clerk hire in the office of the surveyor general for Montana.

On Nos. 18 and 19: Appropriates \$11,100, as proposed by the House, instead of \$12,040, as proposed by the Senate, for clerk hire in the office of the surveyor general for Nevada.

On Nos. 20 and 21: Appropriates \$14,650, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$11,100, as proposed by the House, for clerk hire in the office of the surveyor general for New Mexico.

On Nos. 22 and 23: Appropriates \$13,500, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$11,100, as proposed by the House, for clerk hire in the office of the surveyor general for Utah.

On Nos. 24 and 25: Appropriates \$9,980, as proposed by the House, instead of \$10,600, as proposed by the Senate, for clerk hire in the office of the surveyor general for Wyoming.

On No. 26: Appropriates \$365,000, instead of \$360,000 as proposed by the House and \$370,000 as proposed by the Senate, for contingent expenses of land offices.

On No. 27: Appropriates \$699,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$650,000, as proposed by the House, for surveying public lands.

On No. 28: Inserts the proviso, proposed by the Senate, making \$50,000 of the appropriation for surveying public lands available for surveys and resurveys of public lands deemed to be valuable for oil and oil shale, but strikes out that portion of the proviso making the sum available for office work in offices of surveyors general.

On No. 29: Restores the words "including peyote," as inserted by the House and stricken out by the Senate, to the paragraph making appropriation for the suppression of the traffic in intoxicating liquors and deleterious drugs among Indians.

On No. 32: Strikes out the provision, inserted by the Senate, extending until December 31, 1924, the time for the reimbursement of the sums appropriated for the benefit of the Indians of the Klamath Indian Reservation in Oregon, under the authority of the last paragraph of section 19 of the Indian appropriation act approved May 25, 1918.

On No. 33: Makes immediately available, as proposed by the Senate, \$35,000 of the sum appropriated for continuing construction of an irrigation system within the diminished Shoshone or Wind River Reservation in Wyoming.

On Nos. 34 and 35: Appropriates \$3,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$4,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the salary of the disbursing clerk for the payment of pensions.

On No. 38: Appropriates \$300,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$325,000, as proposed by the Senate, for geologic surveys.

On No. 39: Appropriates \$280,000, instead of \$225,000, as proposed by the House, and \$300,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the examination and classification of lands by the Geological Survey.

On No. 40: Corrects the total for the Geological Survey.

On No. 41: Restores the paragraphs, inserted by the House and stricken out by the Senate, authorizing the acquisition of land by the Bureau of Mines for fuel yard and garage purposes.

On No. 42: Appropriates \$75,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$33,000, as proposed by the House, for the purchase of land at Bruceton, Pa., and makes the sum available for the purchase of the unmined coal surrounding the mine.

On Nos. 43, 44, and 45, relating to Glacier National Park, Mont.: Appropriates \$100,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$125,000, as proposed by the Senate, for maintenance; and appropriates \$125,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$115,000, as proposed by the House, for construction of physical improvements.

On Nos. 46, 47, and 48, relating to Mesa Verde National Park, Colo.: Appropriates \$25,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$21,000, as proposed by the House, for maintenance; and appropriates \$10,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$14,000, as proposed by the Senate, for construction of physical improvements.

On Nos. 49 and 50, relating to Mount Rainier National Park, Wash.: Appropriates \$73,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$85,000, as proposed by the House, for construction of physical improvements, and makes \$38,000 of that sum available for "completion of the widening," instead of "continuing widening," as proposed by the Senate, of the Nisqually entrance to Paradise Valley Road.

On Nos. 51 and 52, relating to Sequoia National Park, Calif.: Appropriates \$85,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$80,000, as proposed by the House, for construction of physical improvements.

On No. 54, relating to purchase of supplies, etc., by the National Park Service outside the District of Columbia: Provides that same may, when the aggregate amount does not exceed \$50, be made in the open market in the manner common among business men, "without compliance with sections 3709 and 3744 of the Revised Statutes of the United States," as proposed by the Senate, instead of without "contract or bond," as proposed by the House.

On Nos. 55 and 56, relating to Columbia Institution for the Deaf: Appropriates \$97,000 instead of \$95,000, as proposed by the House, and \$100,000, as proposed by the Senate, for support of the institution, and appropriates \$10,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$9,000, as proposed by the House, for repairs to buildings.

The committee of conference have not agreed upon the following amendments of the Senate:

On Nos. 1 and 2: Appropriating \$4,000, instead of \$3,500, as proposed by the House, for the salary of the chief clerk of the Department of the Interior.

On No. 20: Fixing the fees to be paid by the heirs of deceased Indian allottees for the determination of their right, title, or interest in any trust or restricted property.

On No. 31: Equipping and maintaining the former Fort Apache military post in Arizona as an Indian boarding school.

On No. 36: Fixing the sale price for certain papers reproduced for sale by the Patent Office.

On No. 37: Relating to the repayment of the construction cost of the Milk River irrigation project, Montana.

On No. 53: Relating to the sale and donation of surplus animals inhabiting Yellowstone National Park.

LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
BURTON L. FRENCH,
C. D. CARTER,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I think that no large appropriation bill passed by the House was ever accepted by the Senate in a greater degree than this bill. The Senate added only \$411,000 to a bill which passed the House at \$294,347,000. We retain the language almost altogether. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by making a detailed statement of the financial changes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record in the manner indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The statement is as follows:

Interior Department appropriation bill, 1924.

CONFERENCE REPORT.

Total appropriations Interior Department, 1923	\$297,212,065.10
Budget, 1924	295,358,252.00
Amount of bill as passed Senate	294,758,000.00
Amount of bill as passed House	294,347,000.00
Added by the Senate	411,000.00

House has receded from	\$222,500.00
House managers will recommend further recessions amounting to	105,800.00
Total House recession	328,300.00

Senate has receded from	72,750.00
Senate recession involved in Theodore Roosevelt Indian School amendment, which the House managers will recommend to recede from and concur in with an amendment	9,950.00

Total Senate recession	82,700.00
------------------------	-----------

Bill as agreed upon then will total	294,675,300.00
-------------------------------------	----------------

House recessions:	
Printing and binding, Bureau of Mines	900.00
Clerk hire, offices of surveyors general	10,000.00
Contingent expenses, land offices	5,000.00
Surveying public lands	49,000.00
Classification of lands, Geological Survey	55,000.00
Purchase of land at Bruceton, Pa., under Bureau of Mines	42,000.00
Glacier National Park	10,000.00
Mesa Verde National Park	4,000.00
Mount Rainier National Park	38,000.00
Sequoia National Park	5,000.00
Columbia Institution for Deaf	3,000.00
Total	222,500.00

Senate recessions:	
Prohibition in Alaska (restoration of House item)	15,000.00
Clerk hire, offices of surveyors general	4,750.00
Contingent expenses, land offices	5,000.00
Disbursing officer for payment of pensions	1,000.00
Geologic surveys	25,000.00
Classification of lands, Geological Survey	20,000.00
Glacier National Park	25,000.00
Mesa Verde National Park	4,000.00
	87,750.00
Net Senate recessions	72,750.00

Items brought back:	
Office of Secretary, salary of chief clerk—	
House figure	3,500.00
Senate figure	4,000.00
Proposed figure	4,000.00
Theodore Roosevelt Indian School—	
House figure	None.
Senate figure	115,250.00
Proposed figure	105,300.00

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken, and the conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 1: Page 2, line 8, strike out "\$3,500" and insert "\$4,000."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, upon that the Senate restored the figure to the amount that the official is now drawing under the current law. I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 1.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3 of the bill, line 9, strike out the figures "\$221,520" and insert the figures "\$222,020."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, that is merely a change in the total, and I move that the House recede and concur.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 30: Page 29, line 23, after the word "herein," insert: "Provided further, That hereafter upon a determination of the heirs to any trust or restricted Indian property of the value of \$250 or more, or to any allotment, or, after approval by the Secretary of the Interior, of any will covering such trust or restricted property, there shall be paid by such heirs, or by the beneficiaries under such will, or from the estate of the decedent, or from the proceeds of sale of the allotment, or from any trust funds belonging to the estate of the decedent, the sum of \$20 where the appraised value of the estate of the decedent is \$250 or more and does not exceed \$1,000. Where the appraised value of the estate of the decedent is more than \$1,000 and less than \$2,000, \$25; where the appraised value of the estate of the decedent is \$2,000 or more and does not exceed \$3,000, \$30; where the appraised value of the estate of the decedent is more than \$3,000 but does not exceed \$5,000, \$50; where the appraised value of the estate of the decedent is more than \$5,000 but does not exceed \$7,500, \$65; and where the appraised value of the estate of the decedent is more than \$7,500, \$75; which amount shall be accounted

for and paid into the Treasury of the United States, and a report shall be made annually to Congress by the Secretary of the Interior on or before the first Monday in December of all moneys collected and deposited as herein provided."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur. And in connection with that I would like to state, Mr. Speaker, that this language provides for the increased fees to be paid out of the estates of Indians in certain cases. It is recommended by the Indian Bureau. The same language is embodied in a bill which has been recommended to the House by the Committee on Indian Affairs. I have consulted the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER], chairman of that committee, and our action in this instance is not disagreed to by him.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman will permit, it is also stated by the Indian Bureau under the present language of the law a deficiency occurs each year and this matter is not self-sustaining. Under these changes it is thought by the bureau that the item will be completely self-sustaining.

Mr. CRAMTON. It will make this work self-sustaining.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. Wherein does the suggested legislative amendment differ from existing law?

Mr. CRAMTON. There is some increase in the fee charged.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman any data as to the amount of money that at present accrues from the administration of these trust estates, and how much it is estimated will accrue if this provision is adopted?

Mr. CRAMTON. My recollection is that there is a deficiency of between \$7,000 and \$8,000 under this statute, and that this increase of fee will be sufficient to take care of that deficit. In other words, the increase will be somewhere between \$7,000 and \$8,000, or a little more.

Mr. STAFFORD. How much accrues under the existing law at the present rates?

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not have that at hand at the moment, although it is in the hearings. I will say that our committee went into this in the hearings, but because it is a legislative item we did not include it in the bill as reported by us.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the theory upon which the Government is proceeding to levy fees on trust estates when they are transferred to the various Indians?

Mr. CRAMTON. The scale of fees under the present law runs from \$15 to \$50. The change proposed is from \$20 to \$75.

Mr. STAFFORD. The theory in levying the fee is that there would be a sufficient amount raised to meet the administration expenses of the trust?

Mr. CRAMTON. That is the idea.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 31: After line 7 insert—

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, without the reading of the amendment, to move to recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, is it very long? Mr. CRAMTON. The only difference between the Senate amendment and the House amendment is a cut of about \$10,000. I will withdraw my request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 31: Page 34, after line 7, insert: "The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to establish and maintain the former Fort Apache military post as an Indian boarding school for the purpose of carrying out treaty obligations, to be known as the Theodore Roosevelt Indian School. For support and education of 350 pupils, including pay of superintendent, \$78,750; for repairs, remodeling, and improvement, \$17,800; for purchase of equipment, \$17,500; for collection and transportation of pupils, \$1,200; in all, \$115,250, to be immediately available: *Provided*, That the Fort Apache military post, and land appurtenant thereto, shall remain in the possession and custody of the Secretary of the Interior so long as they shall be required for Indian school purposes."

Mr. CRAMTON. I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan moves to recede and concur with an amendment. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CRAMTON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 31 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to establish and maintain the former Fort Apache military post as an Indian boarding school for the purpose of carrying out treaty obligations, to be known as the Theodore Roosevelt Indian School. For support and education of 350 pupils, including pay of superintendent, \$70,000; for repairs, remodeling, and improvement, \$17,800; for purchase of equipment, \$17,500; in all, \$105,300, to be immediately available: *Provided*, That the Fort Apache military post, and land appurtenant thereto, shall remain in the possession and custody of the Secretary of the Interior so long as they shall be required for Indian school purposes."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Michigan, to recede and concur with an amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain in a word how these children are receiving instruction?

Mr. CRAMTON. They are not receiving it. We have treaty obligations with the Navajos, but, as I remember, there are about 2,000 that are not in schools.

Mr. CARTER. Five thousand.

Mr. CRAMTON. This will take care of a portion of them, utilizing a military post for that purpose; a post that is not now in use. The amendment that I am offering reduces the item about \$10,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Michigan, to concur with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 36: On page 77, line 22, insert: "Such papers when reproduced for sale to be sold at not less than cost plus 10 per cent."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan moves to recede and concur with an amendment. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CRAMTON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 36 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Such other papers when reproduced for sale to be sold at not less than cost plus 10 per cent."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, the only change suggested in my amendment is to insert the word "other," in order to clarify the sense.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is not intended that the papers included in the proceedings shall be sold in that way, but only "other papers" are to be sold under these conditions?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; only that class of papers. The preceding classes are covered by existing law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 37: Page 85, line 13, insert: "*Provided*, That repayment of the construction cost of the project may be made through a division by the Secretary of the Interior of such cost into a primary construction charge and a supplemental construction charge, of approximate equality, the former payable according to section 2 and the latter payable according to section 4 of the extension act of August 13, 1914 (38 Stat. L., p. 686)."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan moves that the House recede and concur.

Mr. CRAMTON. And in connection with that I should state that this came to us and a hearing was had upon it, but it being of a legislative character, it was not included in the bill by the House committee. It has the full indorsement of Director Davis. It is apparent that something must be done. It only puts this project within the existing law referred to. It has the approval of Mr. SMITH, chairman of the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands of the House, and our course in agreeing to it was in accordance with his wishes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 53: Page 107, line 8, insert: "Hereafter the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion and under regulations to be prescribed by him, to give surplus elk, buffalo, bear, beaver, and predatory animals inhabiting Yellowstone National Park to Federal, State, county, and municipal authorities for preserves, zoos, zoological gardens, and parks: *Provided*, That the said Secretary may sell or otherwise dispose of the surplus buffalo of the Yellowstone National Park herd, and all moneys received from the sale of any such surplus buffalo shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan moves to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. CRAMTON. That provision, Mr. Speaker, is the recommendation of Mr. Albright, the superintendent of the Yellowstone National Park and is to meet their pressing problems. I have consulted with the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SINNOTT], chairman of the Committee on the Public Lands, who is in accord with the amendment. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks to include the statement of Mr. Albright.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to is as follows:

The above provision authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to give surplus elk, bear, beaver, and predatory animals to public institutions. It also authorizes the donation of buffalo in the same manner, but in addition gives the Secretary permission to sell or otherwise dispose of the buffalo as may, in his judgment, seem advisable. In this latter instance he is not bound to confine the disposition to public institutions.

For some years past the department has been donating surplus elk, buffalo, and other animals to public preserves, municipal parks, etc., and this practice has enabled many States to stock their lands with animals, particularly elk, besides reducing to a degree the problem in Yellowstone—which, by the way, exists in no other national park—of caring for more animals than is economically possible. An investigation made a year or two ago by the Biological Survey of the United States Department of Agriculture produced evidence that the whole experiment of transplanting elk was very successful. These animals are shipped in larger numbers than any of the others because their population is larger and they multiply comparatively fast.

The authority sought above therefore, as far as the animals generally are concerned, is only to give sanction to what has heretofore been considered proper within the administrative discretion of the Secretary. It will, however, prevent any question arising in the future in connection with this feature of park work.

Notwithstanding the fact that practically every request for buffalo coming from a public institution has been granted, the demand from this source is too limited to have any appreciable effect in keeping the herd to such a size that it can be accommodated on the range that is available. Therefore, in the interests of better administration it is desirable that some other means should be available for disposing of the surplus, either by sale or otherwise, in the discretion of the Secretary. For instance, there are in this country a number of private owners of buffalo herds who are making a bona fide effort to reestablish this magnificent animal, and to encourage them in the undertaking the department should be in a position to allow them from time to time to have some of the surplus Yellowstone buffalo for the infusion of new blood.

An expression of opinion of the proposed plan for the distribution of surplus buffalo was recently sought from some of the foremost game conservation organizations in this country, and favorable replies were received from the American Humane Association, the National Association of Audubon Societies, the American Game Protective and Propagation Association, and the New York Zoological Society.

The "game" herd of buffalo in Yellowstone Park was established under authority contained in the act of July 1, 1902 (32 Stat., 574), with an appropriation of \$15,000 for the purpose. Twenty-one animals were purchased in the fall of that year, and these have multiplied until now the herd contains 578. It is estimated that the "wild" herd, a remnant of the vast herds that once roamed this region, numbers from 125 to 150, but it has no place in the present discussion.

In the distribution of buffalo or other animals no expense is incurred by the Government, as the invariable rule has been made that the recipient must defray all expenses incident to capturing, crating, and transporting the animals.

H. M. ALBRIGHT,
Superintendent Yellowstone National Park.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, one of its clerks, announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. SUTHERLAND and Mr. GERRY members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the office of the Comptroller General of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to

the bill H. R. 13559, "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes."

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 3846. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a Veterans' Bureau and to improve the facilities and service of such bureau, and further to amend and modify the war risk insurance act," approved August 9, 1921; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message, in writing, from the President was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. COLTON. I renew my request for unanimous consent for change of reference of House Concurrent Resolution 77 from the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah asks unanimous consent for the change of reference referred to. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have examined the resolution since the gentleman proffered his request a few moments ago, and I have no objection to the change of reference. I want simply to say that it is a rather singular sort of resolution. It provides for the appointment by the President of the United States of a committee made up wholly of Members of Congress. I have an idea that some Members of the House may object to that kind of legislation.

Mr. COLTON. In answer to what the gentleman has said I will say that this is a resolution introduced by Senator NICHOLSON, of Colorado, and introduced in the House by me at his request. It will be rewritten and changed and reintroduced, and the provision that the gentleman refers to will be eliminated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the reference of the resolution will be made as requested.

There was no objection.

CLAIMS OF NORWEGIAN SUBJECTS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 288).

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President, which, with the accompanying documents, was ordered printed and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report of the Secretary of State respecting the arbitration of claims of Norwegian subjects against the United States arising out of requisitions by the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation requesting that I recommend that an appropriation be made to satisfy the award rendered by the arbitral tribunal against the United States, with interest to date of payment, and that in making the appropriation authorization be granted to withhold from the total amount of the award the sum of \$22,800 with which to pay the claim of Page Bros., American citizens, mentioned in the agreement of June 30, 1921, and in the award of the tribunal.

I recommend that in order to effect prompt satisfaction of the award made by the arbitral tribunal the Congress authorize the requisite appropriation.

A copy of the award is attached hereto.

WARREN G. HARDING.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 12, 1923.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the bill passed to-day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. HOCH, for two days, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the House, under the order heretofore made, adjourned until Sunday, January 14, 1923, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

905. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of Ponce Harbor, P. R. (H. Doc. No. 532); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

906. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation providing that hereafter members of the Officers' Reserve Corps when called into active service, irrespective of the length of such service, shall receive the same mileage allowance as that provided by law for officers of the Army when traveling under competent orders without troops; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LANGLEY: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. H. R. 10799. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to grant permission to the city of Philadelphia, Pa., to widen Haines Street in front of the National Cemetery, Philadelphia, Pa.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1396). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LANGLEY: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. H. R. 13046. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to convey to the city of Wilmington, N. C., marine hospital reservation; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1398). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 10816. A bill to fix the annual salary of the collector of customs for the district of North Carolina; without amendment (Rept. No. 1399). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. McARTHUR: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 10280. A bill for the relief of Pay Inspector Charles R. O'Leary, United States Navy; with amendments (Rept. No. 1389). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SWING: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 10774. A bill for the relief of John H. Lang; without amendment (Rept. No. 1390). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SWING: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 1263. A bill for the relief of Charles L. McCulley; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1391). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KRAUS: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 9376. A bill for the relief of John L. Livingston; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1392). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McARTHUR: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 514. A bill authorizing the payment of an amount equal to six months' pay to Josephine H. Barin; without amendment (Rept. No. 1393). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STEPHENS: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 7776. A bill to correct the naval record of Garnet A. Sylvester; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1394). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DARROW: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 4437. A bill for the relief of James H. Gordon; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1395). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following communications, which were referred as follows:

Communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, with a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, to cover the payment of claims for damages to and loss of private property incident to the training, practice, operation, or maintenance of the Army, \$85,692.17; Committee on Appropriations discharged and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the claims of Anton Anderson, of Chinook, Wash., for \$170 as reimbursement of the cost of repairing his fish trap; Committee on Claims discharged and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 13791) granting an increase of pension to certain soldiers of the Mexican War and Civil War and their widows and minor children, widows of the War of 1812, Army nurses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 13792) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire, by condemnation or otherwise, such additional land in the city of Newport News, Va., as may be necessary for the extension and remodeling of the post-office building in said city, to cause said building to be extended and remodeled, and making appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 13793) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes; committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. LINEBERGER: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 421) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A resolution (H. Res. 480) creating a committee on veterans' legislation; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 13794) granting an increase of pension to Minerva J. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 13795) granting an increase of pension to Isabella W. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 13796) granting a pension to Johanna Malone; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 13797) granting a pension to Margie A. Higginbotham; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13798) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Hoffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13799) granting a pension to Helen Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 13800) granting a pension to Neoma Brooks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13801) granting a pension to Noah E. Whaley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SPEAKS: A bill (H. R. 13802) granting a pension to Rosa Gatterdam; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 13803) granting a pension to Anna E. Best; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 13804) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Yoes; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6800. By Mr. BULWINKLE: Resolution of the Statesville, N. C., Farm Loan Association, in regard to proposed legislation affecting the farm loan act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

6801. By Mr. CURRY: Petition of 21 residents of Richmond, Calif., urging repeal of excise tax on small arms and small arms ammunition; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6802. By Mr. CRAMTON: Petition of Max J. Herrman and other residents of Mount Clemens, Mich., urging passage of the resolution introduced to extend aid to the people of Germany and Austria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6803. Also, petition of Albert Kleinschmidt and other residents of Pigeon, Mich., urging passage of the resolution introduced purporting to extend immediate aid to the people of the German and Austrian Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6804. By Mr. FULLER: Petition of H. G. Young and sundry other citizens of Oswego, Ill., favoring repeal of the tax on ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6805. By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition to abolish discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms, signed by 21 citizens of Benton Harbor, Mich.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6806. Also, petition to abolish discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms, signed by 42 citizens of Berrien County, Mich.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6807. Also, petition to abolish discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms, signed by 48 citizens of Center-

ville and Three Rivers, Mich.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6808. Also, petition to abolish discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms, signed by 42 citizens of Constantine, Mich.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6809. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of National Conference of State Manufacturers' Associations, Chicago, Ill., favoring the substitution of a constructive policy of selective immigration by our Government for our present negative policy; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

6810. By Mr. KUNZ: Petition of Rev. Francis Bimanski and 10 other citizens of Chicago, favoring joint resolution purporting to extend aid to the famine-stricken peoples of the German and Austrian Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6811. By Mr. OSBORNE: Petition of Mr. R. B. Sherwood and 99 other citizens of Los Angeles County, Calif., urging the passage of a law conferring citizenship upon the Indians of the United States, and urging further that if it be necessary under a recent decision to amend the Constitution to accomplish this result Congress pass such amendment and submit it to the States for ratification; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

6812. By Mr. SANDERS of Indiana: Petition of Sallie Dawson and others, of Terre Haute, Ind., relative to House bill 7452; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

6813. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of Ferdinand Leutz and 64 others, Eugene Weigel and 64 others, all of Hebron, N. Dak., urging the passage of legislation granting aid to the famine-stricken peoples of the German and Austrian Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6814. Also, petition of 508 members of the Masonic lodges at Mandan, Minot, Kenmare, Berthold, Glenburn, Beach, Garrison, Bowman, Plaza, Flasher, New England, Hebron, Hazen, Marmarth, Tioga, and Wildrose, N. Dak., urging that the measure known as the Towner-Sterling bill receive early and favorable consideration; to the Committee on Education.

6815. By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition from citizens of the ninth congressional district, Minnesota, in favor of immediate aid to the people of Germany and Austria, to relieve them from famine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6816. Also, petition from citizens of Norman County in favor of legislation to authorize the Government to purchase grain and food supplies in the United States and supplying same to the suffering people of Germany and Austria in sufficient quantities to tide them over till spring, and thus while aiding them supplying a market for the surplus grain in the hands of the American farmer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6817. By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of conservation division of the North Dakota Federation of Women's Clubs, protesting against the passage of Senate bill No. 3519 and urging the passage of the Barbour bill without any amendments which would give to private interests the use of water power; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

6818. Also, petition of Fessenden Community Club, Fessenden, N. Dak., asking that immediate legislation be passed to restore the agricultural industry to a basis where it can be carried on with a profit; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6819. Also, petition of Fred Albrecht and others, of Anamoose, N. Dak., urging that immediate aid be given to the people of the German and Austrian Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6820. Also, petition of O. Lundquist and 762 others, members of the Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, residing in North Dakota, urging an early and favorable consideration of the Towner-Sterling bill and declaring that education is a national question which should have national leadership and national support; to the Committee on Education.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, January 13, 1923.

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 9, 1923.)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate resumes the consideration of House bill 13481, the Agricultural appropriation bill.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to be inserted on page 10, line 18, after the numerals "1914,"

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 10, line 18, after the numerals "1914" and before the colon, insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That in the expenditure of the appropriations carried in this and the preceding paragraph, if the Secretary of Agriculture and the proper officials of the college in any State fail to mutually agree upon the plans employed in the extension or demonstration work, then in no case shall any change in the plan be made in such State different from that employed in such State during the year ending January 1, 1922.

Mr. HARRISON. May I say to the Senator in charge of the bill and to the Senate that this is merely a limitation upon the appropriation, and I have offered it for this purpose and this purpose only. In the administration of the fund the law provides specifically that there shall be complete harmony and cooperation existing between the officials representing the college in each State and the Secretary of Agriculture in undertaking the extension and demonstration work. Indeed, the law specifically states and sets out that there shall be no misunderstanding between the State authorities and the Secretary of Agriculture; that any plan that might be contemplated in the particular State "shall be mutually agreed upon between the Secretary of Agriculture and the proper official representing the college in each State."

It is merely a rumor, so to speak, but I judge from certain remarks made by one of the high officials at a meeting of representatives of the land-grant colleges in Washington recently that there might be undertaken a change in certain States with reference to the extension work. The plan that has been adopted in the States in the South, especially in my State, of which I have more knowledge than of any other, though the plan has been the same in other States, has worked admirably.

The women workers in charge of the home demonstration work with respect to canning clubs organized by the girls have worked wonders. The same statement applies to the work of the demonstration agents with respect to the club work among the boys. They desire no change because they feel that the plan now in vogue in those States is the best plan and will bring about the best and most beneficent results. But the authorities, or one or two of the authorities new in the business in Washington perhaps, desire to change in some particular some special plan. The amendment merely contemplates that where the authorities of the State can not mutually agree with the Secretary of Agriculture, there shall be no change effected, but the same plan shall be adopted that was employed in those particular States in 1921.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. HARRISON. Certainly.

Mr. McNARY. What particular criticism does the Senator find in the law as presently fashioned?

Mr. HARRISON. I have no criticism of the law as presently fashioned. I think it is a very splendid law.

Mr. McNARY. Then why does the Senator seek to change it?

Mr. HARRISON. I will explain why I say that. I know that it seems strange that I should seek to change it in the slightest respect if the present law is all right. The present provision of the law reads:

And all sums appropriated by this act for use for demonstration or extension work within any State shall be used and expended in accordance with plans mutually agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and the proper officials of the college in such State.

That is absolutely all right, but the trouble is that with the power and influence of a certain Assistant Secretary of Agriculture it is contemplated to change the plan in a slight particular in certain States, one in which the authorities of the State might acquiesce, but which is not agreeable to them. The amendment which I have proposed merely provides that in the event they shall not mutually agree, the same plan shall be kept in force which was in force prior to January 1, 1922, and which has been in force heretofore since the enactment of the law.

I might go on and make a very extended argument in behalf of the matter and show more necessity for it. I hope the amendment may be agreed to. It can work no injury to the department, but will make certain officials who have been spending the money in certain States feel better about it and feel that the department is not going to revolutionize the plan that has worked so well in those States. It is feared—in fact, many of them contend—that it will put out of service the women who have gone around and organized the girls into canning clubs and substitute some director of the department who is a man to organize the girls in the canning work. I feel about a man organizing girls to do canning work a good deal like I feel when I see a man operate upon a piano. It seems to me